arXiv:1605.01009v3 [math.PR] 1 Feb 2017

METASTABILITY OF NON-REVERSIBLE RANDOM WALKS IN A POTENTIAL FIELD, THE EYRING-KRAMERS TRANSITION RATE FORMULA

C. LANDIM, I. SEO

Abstract. We consider non-reversible random walks evolving on a potential field in a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$. We describe the complete metastable behavior of the random walk among the landscape of valleys, and we derive the Eyring-Kramers formula for the mean transition time from a metastable set to a stable set.

1. Introduction

Metastability has attracted much attention in these last years in several different contexts, from spin dynamics to SPDEs, from random networks to interacting particle systems. We refer to the recent monographs [22, 8] for references.

At the same time, some progress has been made on the potential theory of non-reversible Markov chains. Gaudillière and Landim [11] derived a Dirichlet principle for the capacity of non-reversible continuous-time Markov chains, and Slowik [24] proved a Thomson principle.

These advances in the potential theory of Markov chains permitted to derive the metastable behavior of non-reversible dynamics. The metastable behavior of the condensate in a totally asymmetric zero-range process evolving on a fixed one-dimensional ring has been proved in [14], and Misturini [21] derived the metastable behavior of the ABC model as the asymmetry increases. In another perspective, Bouchet and Reygner [5] provided a formula, in the context of small perturbations of dynamical systems, for the Eyring-Kramers mean transition time from a metastable set to a stable set.

Motivated by the evolution of mean-field planar Potts model [19], whose dynamics can be mapped to a non-reversible cyclic random walk evolving on a potential field in a simplex, as the mean-field Ising model [9] is mapped to a one-dimensional reversible random walk on the interval, we examine in this article the metastable behavior of non-reversible cyclic random walks evolving in a potential field defined on a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We present a complete description of the metastable behavior of this model, as it has been done in the reversible setting in [18], following the works of [7, 6]. In particular, we prove the Eyring-Kramers transition rate formula [10, 13] which provides the sharp sub-exponential pre-factor to the expectation of the hitting time of the stable states starting from a metastable state. This is done in the general case in which several wells may have the same depth. We refer to [4] for a historical review on the derivation of the Eyring-Kramers formula.

Key words and phrases. Metastability, cycle random walks, non-reversible Markov chains, Eyring-Kramer formula.

Since the works of Bovier, Eckhoff, Gayrard and Klein [7, 6], which established the link between potential theory of Markov chains and metastability, it is known that one of the major difficulties in the proof of the metastable behavior consists in obtaining sharp estimates for the capacity between different sets of wells. In the present non-reversible context, the Dirichlet and the Thomson principles [11, 24] provide double variational formulas for the capacity in terms of flows and functions. These results also identify the optimal flows and functions which solve the variational problem. In particular, the computation of the capacity is reduced to the determination of good approximations of the equilibrium potentials between wells and of the associated flows.

It turns outs that for random walks in potential fields [7, 6, 18], the equilibrium potential drastically changes from 0 to 1 in a mesoscopic neighborhood around saddle points between local minima, and that all the analysis is reduced to a detailed examination of the dynamics around the saddles points.

To our knowledge, this work presents the first rigorous derivation of the Eyring-Kramers formula in a non-reversible setting. It shows that the role played by the non-negative eigenvalue of the Hessian of the potential around the saddle point in reversible dynamics is replaced in non-reversible dynamics by the non-negative eigenvalue of the Jacobian of the asymptotic drift.

2. Notation and Results

The domain and potential field. Let Ξ be an open, bounded and connected domain of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with piecewise C^1 boundary, denoted by $\partial\Xi$. Denote by $\overline{\Xi} = \Xi \cup \partial\Xi$ the closure of Ξ. Let $F : \overline{\Xi} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a potential such that

(1) F is a twice-differentiable function which has finitely many critical points at Ξ, and no critical points at $\partial\Xi$. Furthermore, $\nabla F(\boldsymbol{x}) \cdot \boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x}) > 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\Xi$, where $\boldsymbol{n}(\boldsymbol{x})$ represents the exterior normal vector to the boundary.
(2) The second partial derivatives of F are Lipschitz continuous on every compact subsets of Ξ.
(3) At each local minimum, all eigenvalues of Hess F are strictly positive.
(4) At each saddle point, one eigenvalue of Hess F is strictly negative, all the others being strictly positive.

Consider a sequence of functions $\{G_N : N \geq 1\}$, $G_N : \overline{\Xi} \to \mathbb{R}$. Assume that on each compact subsets of Ξ, the sequence is uniformly Lipschitz, and converges uniformly, as $N \uparrow \infty$, to a continuous function $G : \overline{\Xi} \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $F_N = F + (1/N)G_N$.

The dynamics. Consider a cycle $\gamma = (\boldsymbol{z}_0, \boldsymbol{z}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{z}_L = \boldsymbol{z}_0)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ without self intersections starting from the origin, $\boldsymbol{z}_0 = \boldsymbol{0}$. Assume that the points $\boldsymbol{w}_j = \boldsymbol{z}_{j+1} - \boldsymbol{z}_j$, $0 \leq j < L$, generate $\mathbb{Z}^d$ in the sense that any point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ can be written as a linear combination of the points $\boldsymbol{w}_j$. Let γ^N be the cycle γ scaled by N^{-1}, $\gamma^N = N^{-1}\gamma$, and let $\boldsymbol{z}_i^N = N^{-1}\boldsymbol{z}_i$, $0 \leq i < L$ be the vertices of γ^N. Denote by $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ the cycle γ^N translated by $\boldsymbol{x} \in (N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^d$: $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N = \{\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z} : \boldsymbol{z} \in \gamma^N\}$.

Denote by $\widetilde{\Xi}_N$ the discretization of $\overline{\Xi}$: $\widetilde{\Xi}_N = \overline{\Xi} \cap (N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^d$. Define $\widehat{\Xi}_N$ as the set of points $\boldsymbol{x} \in (N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^d$ such that $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N \subset \widetilde{\Xi}_N$:

$$\widehat{\Xi}_N \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{x} \in (N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^d : \gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N \subset \widetilde{\Xi}_N\}\,, \quad \text{and let} \quad \Xi_N = \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N\,.$$



FIGURE 1. Ξ_N of Ξ with $d = 2$ and $\gamma = ((0,0), (0,1), (1,1), (0, 0)$: The left figure represents the set Ξ and its discretization $\widetilde{\Xi}_N = \overline{\Xi} \cap (N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^2$. In the right figure, points belonging the set $\widehat{\Xi}_N$ are colored in black. For example, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$ since the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ is contained in $\widetilde{\Xi}_N$. These points also belong to Ξ_N by definition. In addition, points colored in gray also belong to Ξ_N, since they lie on a cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$ for some $\boldsymbol{z} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$. Note that $\boldsymbol{y} \in \widetilde{\Xi}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \notin \Xi_N$.

In other words, Ξ_N is obtained by removing points of $\widetilde{\Xi}_N$ which are not visited by cycles $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$. The set $\widehat{\Xi}_N$ can be regarded as the interior of Ξ_N. We refer to Figure 1 for this construction. We define below a Ξ_N-valued continuous-time Markov chain.

Let μ_N be the probability measure on Ξ_N given by

$$\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{Z_N}\, \exp\{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})\}\,, \quad \boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where Z_N is the normalizing factor.

For each $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$, denote by $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}$ the generator on the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ given by

$$(\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}} f)(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N) \;=\; R_j^N(\boldsymbol{x})\, \big[f(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{j+1}^N) - f(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N)\big]\,, \quad 0 \le j < L\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$R_j^N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \exp\big\{-N\,\big(\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - F_N(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N)\big)\big\}\,, \quad \overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1} F_N(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\,.$$

We extend the definition of R_j to $(N^{-1}\mathbb{Z})^d$ by setting $R_j(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{x} \notin \widehat{\Xi}_N$.

Clearly, the measure μ_N restricted to the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ is the unique stationary state of the continuous-time Markov chain whose generator is $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}$. Denote by $X_N(t)$ the Ξ_N-valued, continuous-time Markov chain whose generator is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_N \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N} \mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}\,. \tag{2.3}$$

It is easy to check that the measure μ_N given by (2.1) is a stationary probability measure for the generator $\mathcal{L}_N$. It is reversible if and only if the cycle γ has length 2.

We have three reasons to examine such dynamics. On the one hand, cycle dynamics are the simplest generalization of reversible dynamics. In statistical mechanics, starting from an Hamiltonian, one introduces a reference measure and then a dynamics which satisfies the detailed balance conditions to ensure that the evolution

is stationary (actually, reversible) with respect to the reference measure. The cycle dynamics provide a natural larger class of evolutions which are stationary with respect to the reference measure.

These cycle dynamics appeared before in many different contexts. We refer to Sections 3.3, 5.3 of [12], to [14, 19] and to the citations of [12, Section 3.8] for cycle dynamics in the context of random walks in random environment and of interacting particle systems. Actually, [20, Lemma 4.1] asserts that in finite state spaces the generator of a irreducible Markov chain can be expressed as the sum of generators of cycle dynamics.

Secondly, cycle random walks is a natural model in which to test the Dirichlet and the Thomson principles for the capacity in the context of non-reversible dynamics because these variational problems are expressed in terms of divergence-free flows whose building blocks are cycle flows.

Finally, as pointed-out below in Remark 2.7, in a proper scaling limit, the cycle dynamics considered here converges to a non-reversible diffusion. In particular, the approximations of the optimal flow and of the equilibrium potentials derived in Sections 4, 5 provide good insight for the continuum case.

Denote by $R_N(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$, $\lambda_N(\boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{y} \in \Xi_N$, the jump rates and the holding rates of the Markov chain $X_N(t)$, respectively. A simple computation shows

$$R_N(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N = \boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{x}\} R_i^N(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\;, \quad \lambda_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} R_i^N(\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\;. \tag{2.4}$$

The law of large numbers. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ (resp. $\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$), $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$, the law of the Markov chain $X_N(t)$ (resp. the speeded-up Markov chain $X_N(tN)$) starting at $\boldsymbol{x}$. Expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$, $\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ is represented by $\mathbb{E}_x^N$, $\mathbf{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$, respectively.

Let $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of points in Ξ_N which converges to some $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi$. The sequence $\{\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^N : N \geq 1\}$ converges to the Dirac mass on the deterministic path $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$, which solves the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) \;=\; -\, b(\boldsymbol{x}(t))\;, \\ \boldsymbol{x}(0) \;=\; \boldsymbol{x}\;, \end{cases}$$

where

$$b(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; -\sum_{j=0}^{L-1} e^{(\boldsymbol{z}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{z}})\cdot \nabla F(\boldsymbol{x})} (\boldsymbol{z}_{j+1} - \boldsymbol{z}_j)\;, \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{z}} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \boldsymbol{z}_i\;. \tag{2.5}$$

The time-reversed or adjoint dynamics. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}^*$, $\mathcal{L}_N^*$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$, the adjoints of the generators $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}$, $\mathcal{L}_N$ in $L^2(\mu_N)$, respectively. An elementary computation shows that for $0 \leq j < L$,

$$(\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}^* f)(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N) \;=\; R_j^N(\boldsymbol{x}) \left[f(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{j-1}^N) - f(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N) \right]\;, \quad \mathcal{L}_N^* \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi_N} \mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}^*\;.$$

Denote by $X_N^*(t)$ the Ξ_N-valued, continuous-time Markov chain whose generator is $\mathcal{L}_N^*$. As for the direct dynamics, denote by $\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{*,N}$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$, the law of the speeded-up Markov chain $X_N^*(tN)$ starting at $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Let $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N\}_{N\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of points in Ξ_N which converges to some $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi$. The sequence $\{\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^{*,N} : N \geq 1\}$ converges to the Dirac mass on the deterministic



FIGURE 2. The structure of the valleys.

path $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$, which solves the ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) \;=\; -\, b^*(\boldsymbol{x}(t))\;, \\ \boldsymbol{x}(0) \;=\; \boldsymbol{x}\;, \end{cases}$$

where

$$b^*(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; -\sum_{j=0}^{L-1} e^{(\boldsymbol{z}_j - \bar{\boldsymbol{z}})\cdot \nabla F(x)}\, (\boldsymbol{z}_{j-1} - \boldsymbol{z}_j)\;. \tag{2.6}$$

Note that the macroscopic behavior of the dynamics differs completely from the macroscopic behavior of the time-reversed dynamics. Changing the clock direction of the jumps affects dramatically the global behavior of the chain.

The valleys. Fix H in $\mathbb{R}$, and assume that the set of saddle points of height H, denoted by $\mathfrak{S}$, is non-empty:

$$\mathfrak{S} \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \Xi : \boldsymbol{\sigma} \text{ is saddle point of } F \text{ and } F(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) = H\} \;\neq\; \varnothing\;.$$

Let

$$\widehat{\Omega} \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{z} \in \Xi :\, F(\boldsymbol{z}) \,\leq\, H\}\;,$$

and let Ω be one of the connected components of $\widehat{\Omega}$. The connected components of the interior of Ω are denoted by $\mathring{W}_1, \dots, \mathring{W}_M$, and the closure of $\mathring{W}_i$ is denoted by W_i. Then, $\mathfrak{S}_{i,j} = W_i \cap W_j$, $i \neq j$, is a subset of $\mathfrak{S}$. We assume that the sets $\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}$, $i \neq j$, are pairwise disjoint, *i.e.*, that no saddle point belongs to three sets W_i's. Fix ϵ small enough to prevent the existence of saddle points of F of height between $H - \epsilon$ and H, and denote the connected components of

$$\Omega^\epsilon \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{z} \in \Xi : F(\boldsymbol{z}) \,\leq\, H - \epsilon\}$$

by $W_1^\epsilon, \dots, W_M^\epsilon$, where $W_i^\epsilon \subset W_i$. See Figure 2.

Define the metastable sets $\mathcal{E}_N^1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_N^M$ as

$$\mathcal{E}_N^i \;=\; W_i^\epsilon \cap \Xi_N \quad \text{and let} \quad \mathcal{E}_N \;=\; \bigcup_{k=1}^M \mathcal{E}_N^k \,.$$

Denote the deepest local minima of W_i^ϵ by $\{\boldsymbol{m}_{i,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{m}_{i,q_i}\}$, and set $h_i = F(\boldsymbol{m}_{i,1})$. Let

$$\nu_i \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{q_i} \frac{e^{-G(\boldsymbol{m}_{i,k})}}{\sqrt{\det(\text{Hess } F)(\boldsymbol{m}_{i,k})}} \,. \tag{2.7}$$

It is shown in [18, Section 6] that for every $1 \le i \le M$,

$$\frac{Z_N}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}}} e^{Nh_i} \mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \nu_i \,, \tag{2.8}$$

where $o_N(1)$ is an expression which vanishes as $N \uparrow \infty$.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be the $d \times d$ matrix given by

$$\mathbb{A} \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1})\, \boldsymbol{z}_i^\dagger \,, \tag{2.9}$$

where $M^\dagger$ represents the transposition of the matrix or vector M, and where the points $\boldsymbol{z}_i$ form the cycle γ introduced at the beginning of this section. Let $\mathbb{M}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \mathbb{A}\, \mathbb{H}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, where $\mathbb{H}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = (\text{Hess } F)(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. We prove in Lemma 11.1 that the matrix $\mathbb{M}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ has only one negative eigenvalue, denoted by $-\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. For each $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}$, define

$$\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;=\; \frac{\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}{\sqrt{-\det \mathbb{H}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}}\, e^{-G(\boldsymbol{\sigma})} \,, \;\; \omega_{i,j} \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_{i,j}} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \,, \;\; \forall i \neq j \,, \;\; \text{and} \;\; \omega_{i,i} = 0 \,, \;\; \forall i \,. \tag{2.10}$$

Hitting times and capacities. Denote by $H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $H_{\mathcal{A}}^+$, the hitting time of and the return time to a subset $\mathcal{A}$ of Ξ_N, respectively,

$$H_{\mathcal{A}} \;=\; \inf\{t > 0 : X_N(t) \in \mathcal{A}\} \,, \quad H_{\mathcal{A}}^+ \;=\; \inf\{t > \tau_1 : X_N(t) \in \mathcal{A}\} \,, \tag{2.11}$$

where τ_1 stands for the time of the first jump: $\tau_1 = \inf\{s > 0 : X_N(s) \neq X_N(0)\}$.

For two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N, denote by $\text{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ the capacity between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ for the Markov chain $X_N(t)$:

$$\text{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in A} \mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\, \lambda_N(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N[H_{\mathcal{B}} < H_{\mathcal{A}}^+] \,.$$

Let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$, $\omega_i = \sum_{k \in S} \omega_{i,k}$, $i \in S$, and $\overline{\omega}_i = \omega_i / \sum_{j \in S} \omega_j$. Denote by $\{Y(t) : t \ge 0\}$ the S-valued, continuous-time Markov chain which jumps from i to j at rate $\omega_{i,j}/\overline{\omega}_i$, and by $\mathbf{P}_k^Y$, $k \in S$, the law of the chain $Y(t)$ starting from k. Note that the probability measure $\mu(i) = \overline{\omega}_i$, $i \in S$, is stationary, in fact reversible, for the chain $Y(t)$. Let $\text{cap}_Y(\cdot, \cdot)$ be the capacity with respect to Y:

$$\text{cap}_Y(A, B) \;=\; \sum_{i \in A} \omega_i\, \mathbf{P}_i^Y[H_B < H_A^+] \,,$$

where A and B are disjoint subsets of S. These capacities can be computed by solving a system of at most $M - 2$ linear equations.

Let $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$, $A \subset S$, be given by

$$\mathcal{E}_N(A) \;=\; \bigcup_{i \in A} \mathcal{E}_N^i \,.$$

The following sharp estimate for capacities between metastable sets is proven in Section 7.

Theorem 2.1. *For every disjoint subsets A, B of S,*

$$\frac{Z_N}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} e^{NH} \mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(A, B)\;.$$

Metastability. Let $\hat\theta_i = H - h_i$, $i \in S$, be the depth of the metastable set $\mathcal{E}_N^i$, and let $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \cdots < \theta_l$ be the increasing enumeration of the sequence $\hat\theta_i$, $i \in S$. Hence, θ_i represents the i-th smallest depth of the metastable sets and

$$\{\hat\theta_i : i \in S\} \;=\; \{\theta_m : 1 \le m \le l\}\;.$$

Let $T_m = \{i \in S : \hat\theta_i = \theta_m\}$ be the set of metastable sets whose depth is equal to θ_m, and let $S_m = \bigcup_{m \le k \le l} T_k$, $1 \le m \le l$. Note that $S_1 = S$. The metastable behavior corresponding to the depth θ_m can be represented as a continuous time Markov chain on S_m where the points of S_{m+1} form the set of absorbing points for this chain.

For $1 \le m \le l$ and $i \ne j \in S_m$, let

$$c_m(i,j) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\big\{\mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\}, S_m\backslash\{i\}) + \mathrm{cap}_Y(\{j\}, S_m\backslash\{j\}) - \mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i,j\}, S_m\backslash\{i,j\})\big\}\;. \tag{2.12}$$

Denote by $\Psi_N^{(m)} : \Xi_N \to S_m \cup \{N\}$ the projection given by

$$\Psi_N^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{i \in S_m} i\, \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{E}_N^i\} \;+\; N\, \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N \setminus \mathcal{E}_N(S_m)\}\;,$$

and by $Y_N^{(m)}(t)$ the $S_m \cup \{N\}$-valued, hidden Markov chain obtained by projecting the random walk $X_N(t)$ with $\Psi_N^{(m)}$:

$$Y_N^{(m)}(t) \;=\; \Psi_N^{(m)}(X_N(t))\;.$$

Here and below we use the notation X, Y to represent continuous-time Markov chains whose state space is are subsets of Ξ_N, $S \cup \{N\}$, respectively.

Denote by $\mathbf{Q}_k^{(m)}$, $k \in S_m$, the law of the S_m-valued, continuous-time Markov chain which starts from k and whose jump rates are given by

$$r_m(i,j) \;=\; \mathbf{1}\{i \in T_m\}\frac{c_m(i,j)}{\nu_i}\;,\quad i \ne j \in S_m\;. \tag{2.13}$$

Note that the points in $S_m \setminus T_m = S_{m+1}$ are absorbing states for $\mathbf{Q}_k^{(m)}$. Finally, let

$$\beta_N^{(m)} \;=\; 2\pi N\, \exp\{\theta_m N\} \tag{2.14}$$

and recall from [15] the definition of the soft topology.

Theorem 2.2. *Fix $1 \le m \le l$, $k \in S_m$ and a sequence of points $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N\}$, $\boldsymbol{x}_N \in \mathcal{E}_N^k$ for all N. Then, under $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^N$, the law of the rescaled projected process $Y_N^{(m)}(\beta_N^{(m)} t)$ converges to $\mathbf{Q}_k^{(m)}$ in the soft topology.*

Remark 2.3. *A computation of the capacity of the chain $Y(t)$ shows that $c_1(i,j) = \omega_{i,j}$.*

Remark 2.4. *In view of (2.12) and (2.13), the metastable behavior of the random walk $X_N(t)$ is similar to the one of the reversible random walk in a potential field, discussed in* [18]*, except for the definition of the quantity $\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$.*

However, the proofs in the non-reversible case present two major additional difficulties compared to the reversible case. On the one hand, the computation of the capacities, presented in Theorem 2.1, which rely on the Dirichlet and on the Thomson principles, are much more delicate, as these principles involve double variational problems.

On the other hand, while in the reversible case the asymptotic jump rates (2.13) can be expressed in terms of the capacities, computed in Theorem 2.1, in the non-reversible case, the derivation of the asymptotic jump rates requires a detailed analysis of the behavior of the equilibrium potential. We present in Section 8 a robust framework, which can be useful in other contexts, to obtain sharp estimates of the mean jump rate in case of the non-reversible dynamics.

Eyring-Kramers formula. Fix $1 \le u \le l$ and $i \in T_u$. Select a minimum $\boldsymbol{m}_{i,k}$, $1 \le k \le q_i$ of F on W_i^ϵ and denote this point by $\boldsymbol{m}_i$. Define the set of local minima of F on $\Xi \setminus W_i$ by $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_i$, and let $\mathcal{M}_i$ be the points in $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_i$ which are below $\boldsymbol{m}_i$:

$$\mathcal{M}_i \;=\; \Big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_i : F(\boldsymbol{x}) \le F(\boldsymbol{m}_i) \Big\} \;.$$

Denote by $[\boldsymbol{x}]_N$ the nearest point in Ξ_N of $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi$. If there are several nearest points, choose one of them arbitrarily. Denote by $[\mathcal{M}_i]_N$ the discretization of the set $\mathcal{M}_i$: $[\mathcal{M}_i]_N = \{[\boldsymbol{x}]_N : \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{M}_i\}$.

Theorem 2.5. *For $1 \le u \le l$ and $i \in T_u$,*

$$\mathbb{E}^N_{[\boldsymbol{m}_i]_N} \big[H_{[\mathcal{M}_i]_N} \big] \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1) \big] \, \frac{\nu_i \, \beta_N^{(u)}}{\sum_{j \in S_u} c_u(i,j)} \;. \tag{2.15}$$

If the potential F has only two local minima and one saddle point between them, the right hand side of the previous equation takes the form of the celebrated Eyring-Kramers formula. More precisely, assume that $M = 2$ and that the wells W_1 and W_2 contain only one local minima, denoted by $\boldsymbol{m}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_2$, respectively. Assume that $F(\boldsymbol{m}_1) \ge F(\boldsymbol{m}_2)$, and denote by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ the unique saddle point located between $\boldsymbol{m}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_2$: $\{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\} = \overline{W}_1 \cap \overline{W}_2$. By (2.7), (2.10), (2.14), (2.15) and Remark 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}^N_{[\boldsymbol{m}_1]_N} \big[H_{[\boldsymbol{m}_2]_N} \big] \\ &\quad = \; \big[1 + o_N(1) \big] \, e^{N[F(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - F(\boldsymbol{m}_1)]} \, \frac{2\pi N}{\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \sqrt{\frac{-\det(\text{Hess } F)(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\det(\text{Hess } F)(\boldsymbol{m}_1)}} \, e^{G(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - G(\boldsymbol{m}_1)} \;. \end{aligned}$$

The notable difference of this formula with respect to the Eyring-Kramers formula for the reversible dynamics is the appearance of $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, instead of the absolute value of the negative eigenvalue of the Hessian of the potential F at $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. This replacement was anticipated by the recent work of Bouchet and Reygner [5] in the context of non-reversible Freidlin-Wentzell type of diffusions. Another difference is the appearance of $\exp\{G(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) - G(\boldsymbol{m}_1)\}$. This new term coincide with the so-called non-Gibbsianness factor of [5, display (1.10)]. This term is introduced in order to take into account the fact that the invariant measure μ_N is not exactly Gibbsian. To our knowledge, Theorem 2.5 is the first rigorous proof of the Eyring-Kramers formula for non-reversible dynamics.

Applications, remarks and extensions. We conclude this section with some comments on the results.

In a forthcoming paper [19], we use the results presented in this paper to investigate the metastable behavior of a planar, mean-field Potts model.

Remark 2.6 (Reversibility)**.** *The case in which the cycle γ has length 2 and the dynamics is reversible case has been considered in* [6]*. In this sense, the results presented here provide a generalization of* [6]*.*

Remark 2.7 (Diffusive limit)**.** *Consider the dynamics defined by the generator* (2.3) *with the rates $R_j^N(\boldsymbol{x})$ replaced by*

$$r_j^N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \exp\big\{-\big(\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - F_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_j^N)\big)\big\}\;.$$

Note that the factor N in the exponent has been removed. In this case the rescaled process $X_N(tN^2)$ converges to the diffusion on Ξ whose generator $\mathcal{L}$ is given by

$$(\mathcal{L}f)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; -\,[\mathbb{A}\,\nabla F(\boldsymbol{x})]\cdot(\nabla f)(\boldsymbol{x}) \,+\, (1/2)\sum_{1\le i,j\le d}\mathbb{S}_{ij}\,(\partial^2_{x_i,x_j}f)(\boldsymbol{x})\;,$$

where $\mathbb{S}$ is the matrix

$$\mathbb{S} \;=\; \sum_{j=0}^{L-1}(\boldsymbol{z}_{j+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_j)\,(\boldsymbol{z}_{j+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_j)^\dagger\;.$$

In this context, the matrix $\mathbb{M}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, introduced above (2.10)*, is the Jacobian of the drift $b = \mathbb{A}\,\nabla F(\boldsymbol{x})$ at $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ We investigate in* [17] *the metastability behavior of such diffusions.*

Remark 2.8. *All results of this article hold if the jump rates $R_j^N(\boldsymbol{x})$ introduced in* (2.2) *are replaced by*

$$\widetilde{R}_j^N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \exp\big\{-N\,\big(F_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\bar{\boldsymbol{z}}^N) - F_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_j^N)\big)\big\}\;,$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{z}}^N = L^{-1}\sum_{0\le i<L}\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$.

Remark 2.9. *Although our presentation is limited for a specific level H of saddle points, the complete description of the structure of the wells and of the saddle points corresponding to the potential $F(\cdot)$, presented in the reversible setting in* [18]*, holds for the model introduced in this article.*

Remark 2.10 (Multiple cycles)**.** *Let $\gamma^{(1)},\dots,\gamma^{(K)}$ be cycles on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that edges of these cycles generate $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Denote by $\mathcal{L}_N^{(k)}$, $1\le k\le K$, the corresponding cycle generators and by $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ the sum of these K generators. Denote by $\mathbb{A}^{(k)}$ the matrix introduced in (2.9) associated to the cycle $\gamma^{(k)}$ and let $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}} = \sum_{1\le k\le K}\mathbb{A}^{(k)}$. The matrix $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}$ satisfies the condition of Lemma 11.1 and therefore $\widetilde{\mathbb{M}}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \widetilde{\mathbb{A}}\mathbb{H}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ has only one negative eigenvalue, denoted by $-\widetilde{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. By replacing the matrix $\mathbb{A}$ by $\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}$, the arguments presented in the next sections hold for this general model. The only required modification in the statement of Theorem 2.2 is the replacement of $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ in the definition of $\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ in (2.10) by $\widetilde{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, defined above.*

Remark 2.11 (Generator with weights)**.** *Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ be the generator given by*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N} w_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}\;,$$

where the weights $w_N : \Xi\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the following two conditions:

(1) *The sequence w_N converges uniformly on every compact subset of Ξ to a smooth function $w : \Xi \to \mathbb{R}$;*
(2) *The sequence w_N is uniformly Lipschitz on every compact subset of Ξ.*

The core of the proof of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 consists in a mesoscopic analysis around the saddle points. Under the conditions above, in a mesoscopic neighborhood of a saddle point $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, the weights $w_N(\boldsymbol{x})$ are uniformly close to $w(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and all the arguments of the next sections can be carried through. The assertions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 hold for this model by replacing $\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ in (2.10) by

$$\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;=\; \frac{\mu_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}{\sqrt{-\det \mathbb{H}_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}}}\, w(\boldsymbol{\sigma})\, e^{-G(\boldsymbol{\sigma})}\;.$$

The planar Potts model examined in [19] is an example of dynamics which enters in this framework.

Remark 2.12 (Generalized Potential)**.** *In* [6]*, the authors assumed two properties **(R1)** and **(R2)** for the potential F_N, which are satisfied by the potential of Curie-Weiss model with random external field. We acknowledge here that our result also holds under their assumption, without changing the arguments or the statements of the results.*

We present at the end of the next section a sketch of the proof and a brief description of the content of each section of the article.

3. Sector condition, flows and capacities

The proofs of Theorem 2.1 rely on variational formulas for the capacities in terms of functions and flows, recently obtained in [11, 24]. We present in this section these formulas as well as some properties of the generator needed in the next sections.

Dirichlet Form and Sector Condition. Denote by $\mathcal{D}_N(\cdot)$ the Dirichlet form corresponding to the generator $\mathcal{L}_N$, namely

$$\mathcal{D}_N(f) \;=\; \langle f, -\mathcal{L}_N f\rangle_{\mu_N}\;,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mu_N}$ represents the scalar product in $L^2(\mu_N)$, and f is a real function on Ξ_N. By (2.3), we can decompose this Dirichlet form as

$$\mathcal{D}_N(f) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N} \langle f, -\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}} f\rangle_{\mu_N} \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N} \mathcal{D}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}(f)\;,$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{N,\,\boldsymbol{x}}(f) \;=\; \frac{1}{2Z_N}\, e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \big[f(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) - f(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big]^2\;. \tag{3.1}$$

The next result states that the generator $\mathcal{L}_N$ satisfies a sector condition. This means that the eigenvalues of the operator $\mathcal{L}_N$ complexified belong to the sector $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |\mathrm{Im}\; z| \le 2L\mathrm{Re}\; z\}$ (cf. [23, Proposition 2.13])

Lemma 3.1. *For every function f, $g : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\langle f, -\mathcal{L}_N g\rangle_{\mu_N}^2 \;\le\; 4\,L^2\,\mathcal{D}_N(f)\,\mathcal{D}_N(g)\;.$$

Proof. We first prove the sector condition for each $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}$. Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$. By definition,

$$\langle f, \mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}} g\rangle_{\mu_N} \;=\; \frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} f(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\, \big[g(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) - g(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big] \;.$$

We may rewrite the previous sum as

$$\frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \Big[f(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N) - \frac{1}{L}\sum_{j=1}^{L-1} f(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_j^N)\Big]\, \big[g(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) - g(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big] \;.$$

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the discrete Poincaré inequality we obtain that

$$\langle f, -\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}\, g\rangle_{\mu_N}^2 \;\le\; 4\, L^2\, \mathcal{D}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}(f)\, \mathcal{D}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}(g) \;.$$

The statement of the lemma follows from this estimate and from Schwarz inequality. □

Flows. Fix a point $\boldsymbol{z}$ in $\widehat{\Xi}_N$. Denote by $c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)$, $0 \le i < L$, the conductance of the edge $(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)$ induced by the cycle dynamics $\mathcal{L}_{N,\boldsymbol{z}}$ on $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$:

$$c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) \;=\; \mu_N(\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\, R_i^N(\boldsymbol{z}) \;=\; Z_N^{-1}\, e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{z})} \;. \tag{3.2}$$

Note that the conductance is constant over the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$. We extend the definition of the conductance to the other edges by setting it to be 0: $c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = 0$ if $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \neq (\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)$ for some $0 \le i < L$. Finally, the conductance $c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$, $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\boldsymbol{y} \in \Xi_N$, is defined by

$$c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N} c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;. \tag{3.3}$$

The symmetric conductance $c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ is defined by

$$c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\{c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;+\; c(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})\} \;.$$

Note here that $c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x} \notin \{\boldsymbol{z}_{j+1}^N - \boldsymbol{z}_j^N : 0 \le j < L\}$.

Let E_N be the set of oriented edges defined by

$$E_N \;=\; \{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in \Xi_N \times \Xi_N :\, c_s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) > 0\} \;. \tag{3.4}$$

Clearly, E_N is the collection of all oriented edges of the cycles $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$. An anti-symmetric function $\phi : E_N \to \mathbb{R}$ is called a *flow*. The *divergence* of a flow ϕ at $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$ is defined as

$$(\operatorname{div}\phi)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}:(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\in E_N} \phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;, \tag{3.5}$$

while its divergence on a set $\mathcal{A} \subset \Xi_N$ is given by

$$(\operatorname{div}\,\phi)(\mathcal{A}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}} (\operatorname{div}\phi)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;.$$

The flow ϕ is said to be *divergence-free at* $\boldsymbol{x}$ if $(\operatorname{div}\phi)(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$.

Denote by $\mathcal{F}_N$ the set of flows endowed with the scalar product given by

$$\langle \phi, \psi\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_N} \;=\; \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\in E_N} \frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\,\psi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}{c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})} \;, \quad \text{and let} \quad \|\phi\|_{\mathcal{F}_N}^2 \;=\; \langle \phi, \phi\rangle_{\mathcal{F}_N} \;.$$

From now on, we omit $\mathcal{F}_N$ from the notation above and we write $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle$, $\|\phi\|$ for $\langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\mathcal{F}_N}$, $\|\phi\|_{\mathcal{F}_N}$, respectively.

Dirichlet and Thomson Principles. For a function $f : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$, define the flows Φ_f, Φ_f^* and Ψ_f by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; f(\boldsymbol{x})\, c(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;-\; f(\boldsymbol{y})\, c(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x}) \;, \\ \Phi_f^*(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; f(\boldsymbol{x})\, c(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{x}) \;-\; f(\boldsymbol{y})\, c(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;, \\ \Psi_f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; c^s(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})\, (f(\boldsymbol{x}) - f(\boldsymbol{y})) \;. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

It follows from the definition of these flows that for all functions $f : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$, $g : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle \Psi_f, \Phi_g \rangle \;=\; \langle (-\mathcal{L}_N) f, g \rangle_{\mu_N} \;, \qquad \langle \Psi_f, \Phi_g^* \rangle \;=\; \langle (-\mathcal{L}_N^*) f, g \rangle_{\mu_N} \;. \tag{3.7}$$

Fix two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N and two real numbers a, b. Denote by $\mathfrak{C}_{a,b}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ the set of functions which are equal to a on $\mathcal{A}$ and b on $\mathcal{B}$:

$$\mathfrak{C}_{a,b}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \;=\; \{ f : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R} : f|_{\mathcal{A}} \equiv a,\, f|_{\mathcal{B}} \equiv b \} \;, \tag{3.8}$$

and let $\mathfrak{U}_a(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be the set of flows from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ with strength a:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}_a(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \;=\; \big\{ \phi \in \mathcal{F}_N : (\mathrm{div}\ \phi)(\mathcal{A}) = a = -(\mathrm{div}\ \phi)(\mathcal{B}) \,, \\ (\mathrm{div}\, \phi)(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0 \,,\, \boldsymbol{x} \in (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B})^c \big\} \;. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

In particular, $\mathfrak{U}_1(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is the set of unitary flows from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$.

Recall from (2.11) that we represent by $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ the hitting time of a subset $\mathcal{A}$ of Ξ_N. Denote by $V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} : \Xi_N \to [0, 1]$ the *equilibrium potential* between two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N:

$$V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N [H_{\mathcal{A}} < H_{\mathcal{B}}] \;.$$

Let $V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^*$ be the equilibrium potential corresponding to the adjoint dynamics. The proof of next theorem can be found in [11].

Theorem 3.2 (Dirichlet principle)**.** *For any disjoint and non-empty subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N,*

$$\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \;=\; \inf_{f \in \mathfrak{C}_{1,0}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})} \inf_{\phi \in \mathfrak{U}_0(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})} \|\Phi_f - \phi\|^2 \;.$$

Furthermore, the unique optimizers of the variational problem are given by

$$f_0 \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} + V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^*) \quad \textit{and} \quad \phi_0 \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^*} - \Phi_{V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}}^*) \;.$$

Next theorem is due to Slowik [24].

Theorem 3.3 (Thomson principle)**.** *For any disjoint and non-empty subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N,*

$$\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \;=\; \sup_{g \in \mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})} \sup_{\psi \in \mathfrak{U}_1(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})} \frac{1}{\|\Phi_g - \psi\|^2} \;.$$

Furthermore, the unique optimizers of the variational problem are given by

$$g_0 \;=\; \frac{V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^* - V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}}{2\,\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})} \quad \textit{and} \quad \psi_0 \;=\; \frac{\Phi_{V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^*} + \Phi_{V_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}}^*}{2\,\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})} \;.$$

Comments on the Proof. In view of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3, the proof of Theorem 2.1 consists in finding functions f_N, g_N and flows ϕ_N, ψ_N satisfying the constraints of the variational problems of Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{E}_N(A)$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{E}_N(B)$, and such that

$$\frac{Z_N}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} e^{NH} \|\Phi_{f_N} - \phi_N\|^2 \;\le\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\;,$$

$$\frac{Z_N}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}\, e^{NH} \frac{1}{\|\Phi_{g_N} - \psi_N\|^2} \;\ge\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\;.$$

The crucial point of the argument is the definition of these functions and flows close to the saddle points where the equilibrium potential between two wells exhibits a non-trivial behavior, changing abruptly from 0 to 1.

The main difficulty of the proof of Theorem 2.2 consist in computing the mean jump rates. While in the reversible case, the mean jump rates are expressed in terms of capacities, in the non-reversible setting they appear as the value on a metastable set of the equilibrium potential between two other metastable sets. To estimate this value is delicate because, in contrast with capacities, there is no variational formula for the value at one point of an equilibrium potential.

Theorem 2.5 is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 2.1 and of the fact that the equilibrium potential is close to a constant on each well.

Summary of the article. In Section 4, we construct a function in a mesoscopic neighborhood of a saddle point between two local minima of the potential F which approximates in this neighborhood the equilibrium potential between the local minima. Denote this function by V_N and the local minima by $\boldsymbol{m}_1$, $\boldsymbol{m}_2$. In Section 5, we present a flow, denoted here by Φ_N, which approximates the flow $\Phi^*_{V_N}$ and which is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1, \boldsymbol{m}_2\}^c$. The functions V_N and the flows Φ_N are the building blocks with which we produce, in the next sections, the approximating functions and flows described above in the summary of the proof. In Section 6, we use these functions and flows to prove Theorem 2.1 in the case where A is a singleton and $B = S \setminus A$. In Section 7, we extend the analysis of the previous section to the general case and prove Theorem 2.1. One of the steps consists in determining the value of the equilibrium potential between $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$ in the other wells $\mathcal{E}^i_N$, $i \notin A \cup B$. In Section 8, we compute the asymptotic mean jump rates which describe the scaling limit of the random walk $X_N(t)$. As we stressed above, this analysis requires the estimation of the value at $\mathcal{E}^i_N$ of the equilibrium potential between $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$. We present in that section a general strategy to obtain a sharp estimate for this quantity. In Section 9, we prove the metastable behavior of $X_N(t)$ in all time-scales $\beta^{(m)}_N$ by showing that all conditions required in the main result of [2, 15] are fulfilled. Finally, in the appendix, we present a generalization of Sylvester's law of inertia.

4. The equilibrium potential around saddle points

In this section, we introduce a function V_N which approximates the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}^i_N, \mathcal{E}^j_N}$ around a saddle point $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_{i,j}$. To fix ideas, let $(i,j) = (1,2)$ and assume that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is the origin $\mathbf{0}$, so that $H = F(\mathbf{0})$ is the height of the saddle point $\mathbf{0}$. Throughout the remaining part of this article, C and C_0 represent constants which do not depend on N and whose value may change from line to line.

4.1. **The geometry around the saddle point.** Recall from (2.5) the definition of the matrix b and from (2.9) that we represent by $\mathbb{A}^\dagger$, $\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger$ the transpose of the matrix $\mathbb{A}$, vector $\boldsymbol{w}$, respectively. The Jacobian of b at the origin, denoted by $\mathbb{M}$, is given by

$$\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{A}\mathbb{H} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{A} \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1})\, \boldsymbol{z}_i^\dagger \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{H} = (\mathrm{Hess}\, F)(\boldsymbol{0})\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Remark that

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathbb{A} + \mathbb{A}^\dagger) \;=\; \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{L-1} (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1})\, (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1})^\dagger$$

is a positive-definite matrix because, by assumption, the vectors $\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1} - \boldsymbol{z}_i$ generate $\mathbb{Z}^d$. It follows from this last observation, from the assumption that $\mathbb{H}$ has only one negative eigenvalue and from Lemma 11.1 that $\mathbb{M}$ has only one negative eigenvalue. Denote this eigenvalue by $-\mu$ and denote by $\boldsymbol{v}$ the eigenvector of $\mathbb{M}^\dagger = \mathbb{H}\mathbb{A}^\dagger$ associated to the eigenvalue $-\mu$.

Let

$$\alpha \;=\; \frac{\mu}{\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{A} \boldsymbol{v}} \tag{4.2}$$

and note that $\alpha > 0$ because $\mathbb{A}$ is a positive-definite matrix. Moreover,

$$\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{H}^{-1} \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; -\frac{1}{\alpha} \tag{4.3}$$

because

$$\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{H}^{-1} \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{A}^\dagger (\mathbb{H}\mathbb{A}^\dagger)^{-1} \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{A}^\dagger \left(-\frac{1}{\mu} \boldsymbol{v} \right) \;=\; -\frac{1}{\alpha}\,\cdot$$

Denote by $-\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d$ the eigenvalues of $\mathbb{H}$, and by $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_d$ the corresponding eigenvectors, where $-\lambda_1$ is the unique negative eigenvalue of $\mathbb{H}$. Denote by $v_1, \dots, v_d$ the coordinates of $\boldsymbol{v}$ in the basis $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_d$:

$$\boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \sum_{i=1}^d v_i\, \boldsymbol{u}_i\,. \tag{4.4}$$

With this notation, (4.3) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{v_1^2}{\lambda_1} \;=\; \sum_{k=2}^d \frac{v_k^2}{\lambda_k} \;+\; \frac{1}{\alpha}\,\cdot \tag{4.5}$$

In particular, as $\alpha > 0$, $v_1 \neq 0$. This proves that the vectors $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_1$ are not orthogonal. Assume, without loss of generality, that $v_1 = \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 := \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \boldsymbol{u}_1 > 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *The $d \times d$ matrix $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is non-negative definite and* $\det(\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) = 0$. *The matrix $\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is positive definite and* $\det(\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) = -\det(\mathbb{H})$.

Proof. We first prove that $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is non-negative definite:

$$\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x} + \alpha (\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{v})^2 \;\geq\; 0\,, \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

We consider two cases. Suppose first that $\sum_{2 \leq k \leq d} v_k^2 = 0$. Under this hypothesis, by (4.5), $v_1^2 = \lambda_1/\alpha$ and, writing $\boldsymbol{x}$ as $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i \boldsymbol{u}_i$, the previous sum becomes

$$-\lambda_1 x_1^2 \;+\; \sum_{k=2}^d \lambda_k x_k^2 \;+\; \lambda_1 x_1^2 \;\geq\; 0\,.$$

Suppose, on the other hand, that $\sum_{2\le k\le d} v_k^2 > 0$. Writing again $\boldsymbol{x}$ as $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i \boldsymbol{u}_i$, we obtain that

$$\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x} + \alpha (\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2 \;=\; -\lambda_1 x_1^2 \;+\; \sum_{k=2}^d \lambda_k x_k^2 \;+\; \alpha \Big(\sum_{i=1}^d x_i v_i \Big)^2 \,.$$

By (4.5), this expression is convex in x_1. By optimizing this sum over x_1 and by using (4.5), we show that it is bounded below by

$$\sum_{k=2}^d \lambda_k x_k^2 \;-\; \frac{\Big(\sum_{k=2}^d x_k v_k\Big)^2}{\sum_{k=2}^d (v_k^2/\lambda_k)} \,.$$

The denominator is well-defined by assumption. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this difference is non-negative, which proves the first assertion of the lemma.

We turn to the determinants. Recall the well-known formula:

$$\det(\mathbb{B} + \boldsymbol{u}\boldsymbol{w}^\dagger) \;=\; (1 + \boldsymbol{w}^\dagger \mathbb{B}^{-1} \boldsymbol{u}) \det \mathbb{B} \,, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\mathbb{B}$ is any $d\times d$ non-singular matrix and $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{w}$ are any d-dimensional vectors. It follows from this identity that for any $r\in\mathbb{R}$

$$\det(\mathbb{H} + r\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) \;=\; (1 + r\alpha \boldsymbol{v}^\dagger \mathbb{H}^{-1} \boldsymbol{v}) \det \mathbb{H} \;=\; (1-r) \det \mathbb{H} \,,$$

where the last equality is due to (4.3). This proves that $\det(\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) = 0$, $\det(\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) = -\det \mathbb{H}$.

Finally, the positive definiteness of $\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ follows by the non-negative definiteness of $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$, $\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ and from the fact that $\det(\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) = -\det \mathbb{H} > 0$. □

For vectors $\boldsymbol{w}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{w}_k$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $\langle \boldsymbol{w}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{w}_k \rangle$ the linear space generated by these vectors.

Lemma 4.2. *The null space of $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is one-dimensional and is given by $\langle \mathbb{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v} \rangle$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfies $(\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{w} = 0$. Since $\mathbb{H}$ is invertible, this equation can be rewritten as $\boldsymbol{w} = -\alpha(\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\boldsymbol{w})\mathbb{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}$ and therefore $\boldsymbol{w} \in \langle \mathbb{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v} \rangle$.

On the other hand, it follows from (4.3) that any vector $\boldsymbol{w} = a\mathbb{H}^{-1}\boldsymbol{v}$, $a\in\mathbb{R}$, satisfies $(\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{w} = 0$. □

4.2. **The neighborhood of a saddle point.** Consider the $(d-1)$-dimensional hyperplane $\langle \boldsymbol{u}_1 \rangle^\perp = \langle \boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{u}_3, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_d \rangle$. Clearly, $\mathcal{E}_N^1$ and $\mathcal{E}_N^2$ are on different sides of $\langle \boldsymbol{u}_1 \rangle^\perp$. Since $\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{u}_1 \rangle > 0$, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\boldsymbol{u}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ are directed toward $\mathcal{E}_N^1$, with respect to $\langle \boldsymbol{u}_1 \rangle^\perp$. See Figure 3.

For a subset $\mathcal{G}_N$ of Ξ_N, denote by $\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_N$, $\overline{\mathcal{G}}_N$ and $\partial\mathcal{G}_N$ the core, the closure, and the boundary of $\mathcal{G}_N$, respectively,

$$\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_N \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N : \gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N \cap \mathcal{G}_N \neq \varnothing\} \,, \quad \overline{\mathcal{G}}_N \;=\; \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{G}}_N} \gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N \,, \quad \partial\mathcal{G}_N \;=\; \overline{\mathcal{G}}_N \setminus \mathcal{G}_N \,.$$

One can easily check that $\mathcal{G}_N \subset \mathring{\mathcal{G}}_N \subset \overline{\mathcal{G}}_N$, and that for two subsets $\mathcal{G}_N$, $\mathcal{G}_N'$ of Ξ_N, $\partial(\mathcal{G}_N \cap \mathcal{G}_N') \subset \partial\mathcal{G}_N \cup \partial\mathcal{G}_N'$.

In order to define the approximation of the equilibrium potential and the related flow, as in the reversible case [18], we introduce a mesoscopic neighborhood of the saddle point.



FIGURE 3. The neighborhoods $\mathcal{C}_N$ and $\mathcal{B}_N$ of a saddle point

Let $\varepsilon_N \downarrow 0$ be a sequence such that

$$N\varepsilon_N^2 \uparrow \infty \text{ and } N\varepsilon_N^3 \downarrow 0 \text{ as } N \uparrow \infty\,, \tag{4.7}$$

$$\forall a > 0,\ \exp\{-aN\varepsilon_N^2\} \downarrow 0 \text{ as } N \uparrow \infty \text{ faster than any polynomials of } N. \tag{4.8}$$

One can take, for instance, $\varepsilon_N = N^{-\frac{2}{5}}$.

Denote by C_N, $\mathcal{C}_N$, the mesoscopic neighborhoods of the origin given by

$$C_N \;=\; \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \boldsymbol{u}_i : |x_1| \le \varepsilon_N\,,\, |x_i| \le \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\lambda_i}}\,\varepsilon_N\,,\, 2 \le i \le d \Big\}\,,\;\; \mathcal{C}_N \;=\; C_N \cap \Xi_N\,. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $\partial^*\mathcal{C}_N$ be the piece of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{C}_N$ given by

$$\partial^*\mathcal{C}_N \;=\; \bigcup_{i=2}^d \Big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{C}_N : |\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_i| > \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_1}{\lambda_i}}\varepsilon_N \Big\}\,.$$

We claim that

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\partial^*\mathcal{C}_N} F(\boldsymbol{x}) \;\ge\; H + \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{1}{2}\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2\,. \tag{4.10}$$

Indeed, it follows from the definition of $\mathcal{C}_N$ that $|\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1| \le \varepsilon_N + O(N^{-1})$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^*\mathcal{C}_N$. Since $F(\mathbf{0}) = H$, by the Taylor expansion of F at $\mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\boldsymbol{x}) - H \;&=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{x} \;+\; o(\varepsilon_N^2) \\ &=\; -\frac{1}{2}\,(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1)^2\lambda_1 \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=2}^d (\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_i)^2\lambda_i \;+\; o(\varepsilon_N^2) \\ &\ge\; \frac{1}{2}(-\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_1)\varepsilon_N^2 \;+\; o(\varepsilon_N^2)\,, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. The previous Taylor expansion holds also for $F_N(\boldsymbol{x})$ and for $\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})$ with exactly same form and these Taylor expansions will be frequently used later.

Denote by $\mathcal{B}_N$ the discrete mesoscopic neighborhoods of the origin given by

$$\mathcal{B}_N \;=\; \mathcal{C}_N \cap \Big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N : \, F(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2 \Big\} \,. \tag{4.11}$$

Divide the boundary $\partial\mathcal{B}_N$ in three pieces, $\partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$, $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$ and $\partial^2\mathcal{B}_N$, as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N \;&=\; \big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{B}_N : \, F(\boldsymbol{x}) > H + (1/4)\lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2 \big\} \,, \\ \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N \;&=\; \big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{B}_N \setminus \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N : \, \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 > \varepsilon_N \big\} \,, \\ \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N \;&=\; \big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{B}_N \setminus \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N : \, \boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 < -\varepsilon_N \big\} \,. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\partial^i\mathcal{B}_N$, $i = 1, 2$, is the portion of $\partial\mathcal{B}_N$ close to the metastable set $\mathcal{E}_N^i$. This decomposition is visualized in Figure 3. Note also that it follows from the definitions of $\mathcal{B}_N$ and $\partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$, that

$$F(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; H + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2 \;+\; O(N^{-1}) \quad \text{for} \quad \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N \,. \tag{4.12}$$

Of course, the same estimate is valid for F_N or $\overline{F}_N$.

We claim that $\partial\mathcal{B}_N = \cup_{0 \le i \le 2} \partial^i\mathcal{B}_N$. Indeed, one of the inclusions follows by definition. To prove the other one, fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{B}_N$ and assume that $\boldsymbol{x} \notin \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$, i.e., that $F(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/4)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$. We have to show that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N$. Clearly, $\partial\mathcal{B}_N \subset \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \subset \overline{\mathcal{C}}_N = \mathcal{C}_N \cup \partial\mathcal{C}_N$ so that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{C}_N \cup \partial\mathcal{C}_N$. Assume that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{C}_N$. Then, since $\boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{B}_N$, we have $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{C}_N \setminus \mathcal{B}_N$ and thus $F(\boldsymbol{x}) > (1/4)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$, by definition of $\mathcal{B}_N$, which is a contradiction. This proves that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial\mathcal{C}_N$. It remains to recall the estimate (4.10) to conclude that $|\langle \boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{u}_1 \rangle| > \varepsilon_N$, so that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N$.

Lemma 4.3. *We have that*

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} e^{-\frac{N}{2} \boldsymbol{x}^\dagger (\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) \boldsymbol{x}} \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1) \big] \, \frac{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\sqrt{-\det \mathbb{H}}} \,.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a positive-definite matrix, and let $\mathcal{A}_N$ be a sequence of subsets of Ξ_N such that

$$\Xi_N \cap \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \boldsymbol{u}_i : |x_i| \le a_i \varepsilon_N \,, \, 1 \le i \le d \Big\} \;\subset\; \mathcal{A}_N \;\subset\; \mathcal{C}_N$$

for some $a_i > 0$, $1 \le i \le d$ and for all large enough N. It follows from the proof of [18, Assertion 3.B] that

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{A}_N} e^{-\frac{N}{2} \boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{K} \boldsymbol{x}} \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1) \big] \, \frac{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}}}{\sqrt{\det \mathbb{K}}} \,.$$

The assertion of the lemma follows from this identity, from Lemma 4.1, and from the fact that

$$\Xi_N \cap \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^d a_i \boldsymbol{u}_i : |a_i| \le \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{3(d-1)\lambda_i}} \varepsilon_N \,, \, 1 \le i \le d \Big\} \subset \; \mathcal{B}_N \subset \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N \,,$$

where the first inclusion can be easily proven by the Taylor expansion. □

A similar estimation for $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is needed. Since, by Lemma 4.2, the rank of the matrix $\mathbb{H} + \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is $d - 1$, denote by $\mathcal{P}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the $(d-1)$-dimensional hyperplane given by

$$\mathcal{P}_t \;=\; t\boldsymbol{u}_1 + \langle \boldsymbol{u}_2, \boldsymbol{u}_3, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_d \rangle \,.$$

For any $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, denote by $\mathcal{P}_t(\boldsymbol{w})$ the region located between the hyperplanes $\mathcal{P}_t$ and $\mathcal{P}_t + \boldsymbol{w}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_t(\boldsymbol{w}) \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : t \le \boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 < t + (\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1)\}\,, \tag{4.13}$$

provided $\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 \ge 0$, with an analogous definition in the case $\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 < 0$. Note that $\mathcal{P}_t(\boldsymbol{w})$ includes $\mathcal{P}_t$ but excludes $\mathcal{P}_t + \boldsymbol{w}$.

Let $\mathcal{A}_N(a)$, $a > 0$, be the set defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_N(a) \;=\; \Big\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N : \sum_{i=2}^d \lambda_j (\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_i)^2 \le (1+a)\lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2\Big\}\,. \tag{4.14}$$

Lemma 4.4. *Let $H_N(t,\boldsymbol{z},a)$, $t\in\mathbb{R}$, $\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $a>0$, be given by*

$$H_N(t,\boldsymbol{z},a) \;=\; \frac{1}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{P}_t(N^{-1}\boldsymbol{z})\cap\mathcal{A}_N(a)} e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}}\,.$$

Then, for any $\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, $a>0$, $r>0$ and sequence $\{t_N : N\ge 1\}$, such that $|t_N| \le \varepsilon_N + r/N$,

$$H_N(t_N,\boldsymbol{z},a) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{z}|}{|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{v}|}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha\prod_{k=2}^d\lambda_k}}\,. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. Fix $a>0$ and $r>0$. We may assume that $\boldsymbol{z}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 \neq 0$ since, if this is not the case, $H_N(t,\boldsymbol{z},a)=0$ for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$ so that (4.15) is trivial. We begin by proving (4.15) for $\boldsymbol{z}\in\{\pm\mathfrak{e}_1,\dots,\pm\mathfrak{e}_d\}$, where $(\mathfrak{e}_1,\dots,\mathfrak{e}_d)$ stands for the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is enough to consider the case $\boldsymbol{z}=\mathfrak{e}_i$, the proof for $\boldsymbol{z}=-\mathfrak{e}_i$ being analogous. As explained above, we may also assume that $\mathfrak{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\neq 0$.

For each $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_i)\cap\mathcal{A}_N(a)$, there exists $\delta(\boldsymbol{x})\in(-1/N,\,1/N)$ such that $T(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}+\delta(\boldsymbol{x})\mathfrak{e}_i \in \mathcal{P}_{t_N}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_i)\cap\mathcal{A}_N(a)} e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}} \\
&\;=\; \frac{1+o_N(1)}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_i)\cap\mathcal{A}_N(a)} e^{-\frac{N}{2}T(\boldsymbol{x})^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)T(\boldsymbol{x})}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\sqrt{N}T(\boldsymbol{x})$ by $\boldsymbol{y}$, and approximating the sum appearing on the right hand side by a Riemann integral on the hyperplane $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}$, the previous sum becomes

$$\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\mathfrak{e}_i|}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}\int_{\sqrt{N}(\mathcal{P}_{t_N}\cap A_N)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{y}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{y}}\,dS(\boldsymbol{y})\,, \tag{4.16}$$

where dS represents the $(d-1)$-dimensional surface integral. In this formula, A_N is the set given by

$$A_N \;=\; \Big\{\boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi : \sum_{i=2}^d \lambda_j(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_i)^2 \le (1+a)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2\Big\}\,,$$

and $|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\mathfrak{e}_i|$ appeared to take into account the tilt of the hyperplane $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}$.

Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \sqrt{N}(\mathcal{P}_{t_N} \cap A_N)$ and write $\boldsymbol{x} = \sqrt{N}\big(t_N \boldsymbol{u}_1 + \sum_{2\le j\le d} x_k \boldsymbol{u}_k\big)$. It follows from (4.5), that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H} \,+\, \alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x} \\
&= N\Big[\sum_{k=2}^d \lambda_k\, x_k^2 \,+\, \alpha t_N^2 \lambda_1 \sum_{k=2}^d \frac{v_k^2}{\lambda_k} \,+\, 2\alpha t_N v_1 \sum_{k=2}^d v_k\, x_k \,+\, \alpha\Big(\sum_{k=2}^d v_k\, x_k\Big)^2\Big] \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Using again (4.5), we show that the previous expression is equal to

$$N\Big[\sum_{k=2}^d \lambda_k \,(x_k+\theta_k)^2 \,+\, \alpha\Big\{\sum_{j=2}^d (x_j+\theta_j)v_j\Big\}^2\Big] \,,$$

where $\theta_k = t_N(v_k\lambda_1)/(\lambda_k v_1)$. Hence, by the change of variable, (4.16) can be written as

$$\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\, \frac{|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\mathfrak{e}_i|}{(2\pi)^{\frac{d-1}{2}}} \int_{\sqrt{N}A'_N} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{y}^\dagger(\mathbb{L}+\alpha\boldsymbol{p}\boldsymbol{p}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{y}}\, dy_2\, dy_3\, \cdots\, dy_d \,, \tag{4.17}$$

where $\mathbb{L} = \mathrm{diag}\,(\lambda_2,\dots,\lambda_d)$, $\boldsymbol{p} = (v_2,\dots,v_d)$ and

$$A'_N \;=\; \Big\{(y_2,\dots,y_d)\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1} : t_N\boldsymbol{u}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^d (y_k-\theta_k)\boldsymbol{u}_k \in A_N\Big\} \,.$$

The point $\boldsymbol{w}_N = t_N\boldsymbol{u}_1 - \sum_{k=2}^d \theta_k \boldsymbol{u}_k$ belongs to the interior of A_N because, by definition of θ_k and by (4.5),

$$\sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j\theta_j^2 \;=\; t_N^2 \sum_{j=2}^d \lambda_j \Big(\frac{v_j\lambda_1}{\lambda_j v_1}\Big)^2 \;=\; t_N^2 \frac{\lambda_1^2}{v_1^2}\Big(\frac{v_1^2}{\lambda_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Big) \;<\; t_N^2\lambda_1 \;\le\; [1+o_N(1)]\,\lambda_1\,\varepsilon_N^2 \,.$$

The set A'_N contains therefore a $(d-1)$-dimensional ball centered at the origin and of radius $\delta\varepsilon_N$ for some $\delta>0$. In particular, since $\varepsilon_N\sqrt{N}\uparrow\infty$, the expression (4.17) is equal to

$$\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\mathfrak{e}_i|\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{\det(\mathbb{L}+\alpha\boldsymbol{p}^\dagger\boldsymbol{p})}} \,.$$

To complete the proof, it remains to recall from (4.6) that

$$\det(\mathbb{L}+\alpha\boldsymbol{p}^\dagger\boldsymbol{p}) \;=\; (1+\alpha\boldsymbol{p}^\dagger\mathbb{L}^{-1}\boldsymbol{p})\det\mathbb{L} \;=\; \alpha\Big(\frac{1}{\alpha}+\sum_{k=2}^d\frac{v_k^2}{\lambda_k}\Big)\prod_{j=2}^d\lambda_j \;=\; \alpha\frac{v_1^2}{\lambda_1}\prod_{j=2}^d\lambda_j \,.$$

This proves the lemma in the case $\boldsymbol{z}\in\{\pm\mathfrak{e}_1,\dots,\pm\mathfrak{e}_d\}$.

In order to extend the result (4.15) to general $\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathbb{Z}^d$, we proceed by induction on $|\boldsymbol{z}| = \sum_{1\le i\le d}|z_i|$. The case $|\boldsymbol{z}|=1$ has been established above. For $|\boldsymbol{z}|>1$, we can decompose $\boldsymbol{z}$ as $\boldsymbol{z}=\boldsymbol{w}_1+\boldsymbol{w}_2$ where $\boldsymbol{w}_1,\boldsymbol{w}_2\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $0<|\boldsymbol{w}_1|,\,|\boldsymbol{w}_2|<|\boldsymbol{z}|$. First, if the signs of $\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_2$ are same, then $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}(\boldsymbol{w}_1+\boldsymbol{w}_2))$ can be decomposed into two disjoint sets $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{t_N+N^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}_1}(N^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}_2)$. By the induction hypothesis, (4.15) holds for these two sets and therefore we can verify that (4.15) holds for $\boldsymbol{z}=\boldsymbol{w}_1+\boldsymbol{w}_2$ as well. On the other hand, if the signs of $\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_2$ are different, since by assumption $\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{z}\neq 0$, assume, without loss of generality, that $|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_1|>|\boldsymbol{u}_1\cdot\boldsymbol{w}_2|$. Then, $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}_1)$ can be decomposed into two disjoint sets $\mathcal{P}_{t_N}(N^{-1}(\boldsymbol{w}_1+\boldsymbol{w}_2))$ and $\mathcal{P}_{t_N+N^{-1}(\boldsymbol{w}_1+\boldsymbol{w}_2)}(-N^{-1}\boldsymbol{w}_2)$. Again by the induction hypothesis we can check that (4.15) is valid for $\boldsymbol{z}$ as well. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 4.5. *There exists a finite constant C_0 such that*

$$\frac{1}{N\varepsilon_N}\,\frac{1}{N^{\frac{d-1}{2}}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}_N} e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}} \;\le\; C_0\,.$$

Proof. Choose a large enough for $\mathcal{A}_N(a)$ to contain $\mathcal{B}_N$. Divide the set $\mathcal{B}_N$ into $O(N\varepsilon_N)$ slices of the form $\mathcal{P}_t(N^{-1}\mathfrak{e}_i)$ for some $\mathfrak{e}_i$ such that $\mathfrak{e}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\neq 0$. The results follows from Lemma 4.4, by observing that all the estimates were uniform on $|t_N|\le\varepsilon_N + r/N$. □

4.3. **The equilibrium potential near a saddle point.** We now derive an approximation of the equilibrium potential on the box $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$. By definition of the generator, for a smooth function $f:\Xi\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_N f(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} e^{-N\left[\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)-F_N(\boldsymbol{x})\right]}\left[f(\boldsymbol{x}+(\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N))-f(\boldsymbol{x})\right]\,.$$

Performing a second-order Taylor expansion, and recalling that $|\boldsymbol{x}| = O(\varepsilon_N)$ for $\boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, we obtain that $\mathcal{L}_N f(\boldsymbol{x}) = (1+\varepsilon_N)\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N f(\boldsymbol{x})$, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N$ is the second-order differential operator given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N f(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{2N^2}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\boldsymbol{w}_i^\dagger[D^2 f(\boldsymbol{x})]\boldsymbol{w}_i \;-\; \frac{1}{N}\,\mathbb{M}\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\nabla f(\boldsymbol{x})\,,$$

where $\boldsymbol{w}_i = \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_i$, $0\le i<L$. It is not difficult to check that the function $V_N:\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N\to(0,1)$ defined by

$$V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \int_{-\infty}^{\sqrt{\alpha N}(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}\,dy\,, \tag{4.18}$$

solves the equation $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N V_N = 0$ on $\mathcal{B}_N$. The function V_N is therefore the natural candidate for the approximation of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\mathcal{E}_N^2}$ on $\mathcal{B}_N$.

The next result states that $\mathcal{L}_N V_N(\boldsymbol{x})$ is small in the set $\mathcal{B}_N$, as expected from its definition.

Lemma 4.6. *There exists a finite constant $C_0<\infty$, independent of N, such that*

$$|\mathcal{L}_N V_N(\boldsymbol{x})| \;\le\; C_0\,\frac{\varepsilon_N^2}{\sqrt{N}}\,\exp\Big\{-\frac{1}{2}\,\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2\Big\}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}_N$.

Proof. A straightforward calculation gives that there exists a finite constant C_0 such that

$$\big|\,\partial^k V_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\big| \;\le\; C_0\,\sqrt{N}\,(\varepsilon_N N)^{k-1}\,\exp\Big\{-\frac{1}{2}\,\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2\Big\}$$

for all $1\le k\le 3$, $\boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, where $\partial^k V_N$ represents any partial derivative of V_N of order k. On the other hand, by the Taylor expansion, $\partial_j F(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; (\mathbb{H}\,\boldsymbol{x})_j + O(\varepsilon_N^2)$ so that

$$-N\,[\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)-F_N(\boldsymbol{x})] \;=\; (\boldsymbol{z}_i-\bar{\boldsymbol{z}})\cdot\mathbb{H}\,\boldsymbol{x} \;+\; O(\varepsilon_N^2)\,.$$

It follows from these estimates and from the fact that $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N V_N$ vanishes on $\mathcal{B}_N$ that

$$\big|\,(\mathcal{L}_N V_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\,\big| \;=\; \big|\,(\mathcal{L}_N V_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) - (\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_N V_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\,\big| \;\le\; C_0\,N^{-1/2}\varepsilon_N^2\,e^{-(1/2)\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2}\,,$$

as claimed. □

The next lemma asserts that the value of the function V_N at the boundary of $\mathcal{B}_N$ is close to the one of the equilibrium potential. For $r > 0$, let

$$\partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N \;=\; \big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N : \mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon_N}) \le N^{-1} r \big\} \,,$$
$$\partial_r^2 \mathcal{B}_N \;=\; \big\{ \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N : \mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}, \mathcal{P}_{-\varepsilon_N}) \le N^{-1} r \big\} \,,$$

where $\mathrm{dist}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the usual Euclidean distance.

Lemma 4.7. *For every $r > 0$, there exist constants $0 < c_0 < C_0$, independent of r and N, and $N_0 = N_0(r)$ such that*

$$e^{-N[\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})-H]}\,[1 - V_N(\boldsymbol{x})]^2 \;\le\; C_0\, e^{-c_0 N \varepsilon_N^2} \,, \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N \,,$$
$$e^{-N[\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})-H]} V_N(\boldsymbol{x})^2 \;\le\; C_0\, e^{-c_0 N \varepsilon_N^2} \,, \quad \forall\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \partial_r^2 \mathcal{B}_N \,,$$

for all $N \ge N_0$.

Proof. We prove the first estimate, the second one being identical. By definition of V_N and by a Taylor expansion of F_N, it suffices to show that there exist $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x}} \Big(\int_{\sqrt{\alpha N}(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} dy \Big)^2 \;\le\; e^{-c_0 N \varepsilon_N^2} \tag{4.19}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N$.

In view of (4.5), let $0 < \delta < v_1$ such that

$$\Big(\frac{v_1^2}{\lambda_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \Big) (\lambda_1 + \delta) \;<\; (v_1 - \delta)^2 \,.$$

We claim that there exists $N_0 = N_0(r)$ such that for all $N \ge N_0$ and for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ either $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \ge \delta \varepsilon_N$ or $\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x} \ge \delta \varepsilon_N^2$ holds.

Indeed, fix $N \ge 1$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ and suppose that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} < \delta \varepsilon_N$ and $\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x} < \delta \varepsilon_N^2$. Since $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs to $\partial_r^1 \mathcal{B}_N$, on the basis $(\boldsymbol{u}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_d)$ it can be expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{x} \;=\; \varepsilon_N (1 + r_N) \boldsymbol{u}_1 \;+\; \varepsilon_N \sum_{k=2}^d x_k \boldsymbol{u}_k \,,$$

where $\varepsilon_N |r_N| \le r/N$. Since $\boldsymbol{v} = \sum_i v_i \boldsymbol{u}_i$, the two conditions on $\boldsymbol{x}$ can be written as

$$(1 + r_N) v_1 - \delta \;<\; -\sum_{k=2}^d x_k v_k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=2}^d x_k^2 \lambda_k \;<\; \lambda_1 (1 + r_N)^2 \;+\; \delta \,.$$

Since $\delta < v_1$, there exists $N_1 = N_1(\delta, r)$ such that $(1 + r_N) v_1 - \delta > 0$ for all $N \ge N_1$. Hence, by taking the square in the first inequality and by applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and recalling (4.5), we have that

$$\big[(1 + r_N) v_1 - \delta \big]^2 \;\le\; \Big(-\sum_{k=2}^d x_k v_k \Big)^2 \;\le\; \sum_{k=2}^d \frac{v_k^2}{\lambda_k} \sum_{k=2}^d x_k^2 \lambda_k$$
$$<\; \big[\lambda_1 (1 + r_N)^2 \;+\; \delta \big] \sum_{k=2}^d \frac{v_k^2}{\lambda_k} \;\le\; \big[\lambda_1 (1 + r_N)^2 \;+\; \delta \big] \Big(\frac{v_1^2}{\lambda_1} - \frac{1}{\alpha} \Big) \,.$$

Since $r_N \to 0$, there exists $N_2 = N_2(r)$ such that for all $N \ge N_2$ this relation is a contradiction with the definition of δ, which proves the claim.

Assume first that $\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\geq\delta\varepsilon_N$. In this case, since $N\varepsilon_N^2\uparrow\infty$, for N sufficiently large the left hand side of (4.19) is bounded above by

$$e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{x}}\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha N}(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2}\Big)^2 \;\leq\; e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+2\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}} \;\leq\; e^{-\frac{\tau}{2}N|\boldsymbol{x}|^2}\,,$$

where τ is the smallest eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix $\mathbb{H}+2\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$. To complete the proof of (4.19), with $c_0=\tau/2$ and under the hypothesis that $\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\geq\delta\varepsilon_N$, it remains to recall that $|\boldsymbol{x}|\geq\varepsilon_N-r/N$ for $\boldsymbol{x}\in\partial_r^1\mathcal{B}_N$.

Suppose now that $\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{x}\geq\delta\varepsilon_N^2$. In this case, the left hand side of (4.19) is bounded above by $\exp\{-(N/2)\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{x}\}\leq\exp\{-(N/2)\delta\varepsilon_N^2\}$, which completes the proof of the lemma. □

Denote by $\mathcal{D}_N(f;U)$ the Dirichlet form of a function $f:\Xi_N\to\mathbb{R}$ restricted to a subset $U\subset\widehat{\Xi}_N$:

$$\mathcal{D}_N(f;U)\;=\;\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in U}\mathcal{D}_{N,\boldsymbol{x}}(f)\,.$$

Let $\{\kappa_N:N\geq1\}$ be the sequence

$$\kappa_N\;=\;\frac{1}{Z_N}\,(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}\,e^{-NH}\,, \tag{4.20}$$

where H represents the height of the saddle points. We also recall from (2.10) that

$$\omega_{\mathbf{0}}=e^{-G(\mathbf{0})}\frac{\mu}{\sqrt{-\det\mathbb{H}}}\,.$$

Proposition 4.8. *We have that*

$$\mathcal{D}_N(V_N;\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N)\;=\;\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\,.$$

Proof. By (3.1), we can write Dirichlet form as

$$\mathcal{D}_N(V_N;\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N)\;=\;\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N}Z_N^{-1}e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}[V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)]^2.$$

In view of the definition (4.18) of V_N and by the Taylor expansion,

$$V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\;=\;\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{2\pi N}}\,\big[(\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\big]\,e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2}$$

where the error term is $o_N(1)$ uniformly in $x\in\mathcal{B}_N$ and $0\leq i<L$. In particular, the right hand side of the penultimate formula can be rewritten as

$$\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{\alpha\,e^{-NH-G(\mathbf{0})}}{4\pi NZ_N}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\big[(\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\big]^2\sum_{x\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N}e^{-N\left\{\frac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{x}+\alpha(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2\right\}}\,.$$

To complete the proof, it remains to use the relation

$$\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}[(\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}-\boldsymbol{z}_i)\cdot\boldsymbol{v}]^2\;=\;\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger[\mathbb{A}+\mathbb{A}^\dagger]\boldsymbol{v}\;=\;2\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger\mathbb{A}\boldsymbol{v}\;=\;\frac{2\mu}{\alpha}\,,$$

where the last identity follows from the definition (4.2) of α, and to recall the statement of Lemma 4.3. □

4.4. **Adjoint dynamics.** We have presented in this section an approximation V_N of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\mathcal{E}_N^2}$. All the arguments presented in this section can be carried to the adjoint process, providing an approximation, denoted by V_N^*, of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\mathcal{E}_N^2}^*$.

Indeed, denote by $\mathbb{M}^*$ the Jacobian of the adjoint drift b^*: $\mathbb{M}^* := Db^*(\boldsymbol{\sigma})$. The Jacobian can be written as $\mathbb{M}^* = \mathbb{A}^\dagger\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}^{-1}\mathbb{M}^\dagger\mathbb{H}$, and thus the eigenvalues of $(\mathbb{M}^*)^\dagger$ coincide with the ones of $\mathbb{M}$. In particular, the unique negative eigenvalue of $\mathbb{M}^*$, denoted by $-\mu^*$, is equal to $-\mu$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}^*$ be the associated eigenvector.

We may define α^* as α has been defined in (4.5) by replacing $\boldsymbol{v}$ by $\boldsymbol{v}^*$ and $\mathbb{A}$ by $\mathbb{A}^\dagger$. Clearly, all identities presented for α also hold for α^* with $\boldsymbol{v}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{v}^*$. Lemmata 4.1 and 4.2 are also in force with the ad-hoc modifications.

The definition of the sets $\mathcal{C}_N$ and $\mathcal{B}_N$ depend only on the Hessian of F at the saddle point, and therefore coincide for the adjoint dynamics. Lemma 4.3 to Corollary 4.5 holds for the adjoint if we replace everywhere α, $\boldsymbol{v}$ by α^*, $\boldsymbol{v}^*$, respectively.

Finally, if we define the function $V_N^* : \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \to (0,1)$ by

$$V_N^*(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \int_{-\infty}^{\sqrt{\alpha^* N}(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}^*)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}\, dy \;,$$

we can prove all statements presented from Lemma 4.6 to Proposition 4.8 with $\mathcal{L}_N^*$, V_N^*, α^*, $\boldsymbol{v}^*$ replacing $\mathcal{L}_N$, V_N, α, $\boldsymbol{v}$, respectively.

5. Flows at saddle points

In the previous section, for a fixed saddle point $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_{1,2}$, we introduced the functions V_N, V_N^* which approximate the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\mathcal{E}_N^2}$, $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\mathcal{E}_N^2}^*$, respectively, in a mesoscopic neighborhood $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$ of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. In this section we present flows which approximate the flows $\Phi_{V_N}^*$, $\Phi_{V_N^*}$ in $\mathcal{B}_N$. These flows, indexed by the saddle points, are the building blocks on which we construct, in the next sections, the flows approximating $\Phi_{V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}}^*$, $\Phi_{V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}^*}$, A, $B \subset S$, $A \cap B = \varnothing$.

We introduce below, in (5.2), the flow Φ_N and we present in Section 5.1 its main properties. In Section 5.3 we present the flow Φ_N^*.

For $\boldsymbol{z} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$ and a function $f : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$, define a flow $\Phi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}^*$, supported on $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$, by

$$\Phi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}^*(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; f(\boldsymbol{x})c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x}) - f(\boldsymbol{y})c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;,\quad \boldsymbol{x}\,,\ \boldsymbol{y} \in \Xi_N \;. \tag{5.1}$$

Fix a saddle point $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_{1,2}$ and let Φ_N be the flow defined by

$$\Phi_N \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\vec{\mathcal{B}}_N} \Phi_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}}^* \;, \tag{5.2}$$

where V_N is the approximation of the equilibrium potential introduced in the previous section. Recall from Section 2 that we denote by $\boldsymbol{m}_i$ one of the global minima of F on W_i and by $[\boldsymbol{m}_i]_N =: \boldsymbol{m}_i^N$ the discrete approximation of $\boldsymbol{m}_i$.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume without loss of generality that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{S}_{1,2}$. There exist a flow $\widetilde{\Phi}_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$ which is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}^c$, and such that*

$$\big(\operatorname{div}\widetilde{\Phi}_N\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_1^N) \;=\; -\big(\operatorname{div}\widetilde{\Phi}_N\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_2^N) \;=\; \kappa_N\,\omega_{\mathbf{0}} \;,$$
$$\|\widetilde{\Phi}_N - \Phi_N\|^2 \;=\; \kappa_N\, o_N(1) \;.$$

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is given in Section 5.4. As in the previous section, we assume below that $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \mathbf{0}$.

5.1. **The divergence of Φ_N.** In this subsection we examine the divergence of the flow Φ_N.

Lemma 5.2. *The flow Φ_N is divergence-free on $\Xi_N \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, and for every $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathcal{B}_N$*

$$(\text{div } \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; -\,\frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})} (\mathcal{L}_N V_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\;.$$

Proof. Fix a point $\boldsymbol{z} \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Since the conductance $c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ vanishes unless $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = (\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)$ for some $0 \le i < L$,

$$\Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \begin{cases} -V_N(\boldsymbol{y})\, c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) & \text{if } (\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = (\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)\;, \\ V_N(\boldsymbol{y})\, c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) & \text{if } (\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = (\boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N, \boldsymbol{z}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\;, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\;. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{x}$ does not belong to the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$ so that

$$(\text{div } \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}})(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; 0 \quad \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \notin \gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N\;.$$

By the additivity of the divergence functional, since $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs only to the cycles $\gamma^N_{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N}$, $0 \le i < L$, for every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$,

$$(\text{div } \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} (\text{div } \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}})(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (\text{div } \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N})(\boldsymbol{x})\, \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\}\;.$$

Therefore, by definition of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $(\text{div } \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N \setminus \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, which is the firs assertion of the lemma.

Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $0 \le i < L$ and assume that $\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$. It follows from the first formula of the proof and from the explicit formula (3.2) for the conductance that

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{div } \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N})(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\quad=\; \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) \;-\; \Phi^*_{V_N,\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N, \boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\quad=\; \frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)} \big[-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) + V_N(\boldsymbol{x})\big]\;. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, summing over i and in view of the penultimate displayed equation, for every $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{div } \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \qquad\qquad (5.3) \\ &=\; \frac{1}{Z_N} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)} \big[V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big]\; \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\}\;. \end{aligned}$$

If $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$ for all $0 \le i < L$, and we may remove the indicator in the previous formula. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

By definition of the flow Φ_N, and in view of (5.1), since the function V_N is absolutely bounded by 1, $|\Phi_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})| \le 2c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$. Hence, by the explicit form of the symmetric conductance, and since $|F_N(\boldsymbol{w}) - \overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{z})| \le C_0/N$ if $\boldsymbol{w}$ belongs to the cycle $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$,

$$\big|\Phi_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\big| \;\le\; C_0\, \frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \quad \text{and} \quad \big|\Phi_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\big| \;\le\; C_0\, \frac{1}{Z_N}\, e^{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{y})} \qquad (5.4)$$

for a finite constant C_0 independent of N.

The next lemma of this section asserts that the divergence of Φ_N on $\mathcal{B}_N$ is small. This result is in accordance with the fact that $\Phi^*_{V_{\varepsilon_N^1,\varepsilon_N^2}}$ is divergence-free on $\mathcal{B}_N$.

Lemma 5.3. *We have that* $\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}_N} |(\mathrm{div}\ \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})| = \kappa_N\, o_N(1)$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, by the second assertion of Lemma 5.2, and by a Taylor expansion of F_N, there exists a finite constant C_0 such that for all $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}_N$,

$$|(\mathrm{div}\,\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})| \;\le\; C_0 e^{-NH}\,\frac{\varepsilon_N^2}{\sqrt{N}}\,\frac{1}{Z_N}\,e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}}\;. \tag{5.5}$$

Hence, the sum appearing in the statement of the lemma is bounded above by

$$C_0\,\kappa_N\,\varepsilon_N^2\,\frac{1}{N^{(d-1)/2}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{B}_N} e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}}\;.$$

By Corollary 4.5, this expression is less than or equal to $C_0\kappa_N N\varepsilon_N^3$ for some finite constant C_0 independent of N. By (4.7), $N\varepsilon_N^3 = o_N(1)$ and the proof of the proposition is completed. □

Proposition 5.4. *We have that*

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N}(\mathrm{div}\,\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{0}}\;,$$
$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\partial^2\mathcal{B}_N}(\mathrm{div}\,\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; -\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{0}}\;.$$

Proof. We prove the first estimate, the arguments for the second one being analogous. By (5.3) and by a change of variables, the first sum appearing in the statement of the proposition is equal to

$$\frac{1}{Z_N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1} e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)}\,\big[V_N(\boldsymbol{x})-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big]\,\mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\}$$
$$=\;\frac{1}{Z_N}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N} e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})}\,\big[V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)\big]\,\mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\}\;.$$

We may rewrite the last sum as

$$\frac{1}{Z_N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})}\sum_{i:\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N}\big[V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)\big]\;, \tag{5.6}$$

where the second sum is carried over the indices i which satisfy the conditions appearing below the sum.

Recall the definition of the set $\mathcal{A}_N(a)$, $a>0$, introduced in (4.14) and set $\mathcal{A}_N = \mathcal{A}_N(1/4)$. By Taylor expansion, every point $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}_N^c$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 = [1+o_N(1)]\varepsilon_N$,

$$F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - H \;\ge\; [1+o_N(1)]\,\frac{1}{8}\,\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2\;. \tag{5.7}$$

We claim that we may restrict the sum appearing in (5.6) to points $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\cap\mathcal{A}_N$. Indeed, fix $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\setminus\mathcal{A}_N$. Since $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 = [1+o_N(1)]\varepsilon_N$. Hence, by the previous paragraph, $F_N(\boldsymbol{x})-H \;\ge\; [1+o_N(1)]\,(1/8)\,\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$, and the sum (5.6) carried over points $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\setminus\mathcal{A}_N$ is of order $\kappa_N\,o_N(1)$ because V_N is bounded by 1.



FIGURE 4. The sets $\mathcal{C}_i$, $\mathfrak{I}_+$ and $\mathfrak{I}_-$

Consider the sum (5.6) carried over points $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N \cap \mathcal{A}_N$. By Taylor's expansion, this expression is equal to

$$\big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \frac{1}{N\, Z_N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N \cap \mathcal{A}_N} e^{-N F_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{i : \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N} (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}) \cdot \nabla V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \, . \quad (5.8)$$

Note that $\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})$ has been replaced by $F_N(\boldsymbol{x})$. Changing variables and taking advantage of the cancellations, the sum over i can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N \\ \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N \notin \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N}} \boldsymbol{z}_i \cdot \nabla V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \; - \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N \notin \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N \\ \boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N}} \boldsymbol{z}_i \cdot \nabla V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \, , \quad (5.9)$$

where both sums are carried over the indices i which satisfy the conditions appearing below the sums.

In view of (5.9), fix a point $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N \cap \mathcal{A}_N$ such that $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ for some $0 \leq j < L$ and that $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N \notin \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ for some $0 \leq k < L$. We claim that $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$.

Indeed, since $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Therefore, to prove that $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$ it is enough to show that $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N \notin \partial \mathcal{B}_N$. By the paragraph succeeding (4.12), $\partial \mathcal{B}_N = \partial^0 \mathcal{B}_N \cup \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N \cup \partial^2 \mathcal{B}_N$.

Since $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N \cap \mathcal{A}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ for some $0 \leq j < L$, as in (5.7), a Taylor expansion shows that $F(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N) - H \leq [1 + o_N(1)](1/8)\lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2$. In particular, by (4.12), $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N$ does not belong to $\partial^0 \mathcal{B}_N$. The point $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_k^N$ does not belong to $\partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ by assumption, and can not belong to $\partial^2 \mathcal{B}_N$ because $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N$ belongs to $\partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$. This proves the claim

It follows from the previous claim that we may replace in (5.9) the conditions $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N \notin \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ by the condition $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_j^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$. Let

$$\mathfrak{I}_+ \, = \, \{i : (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}) \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 > 0\} \, , \quad \mathfrak{I}_- \, = \, \{i : (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}) \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 < 0\} \, .$$

If $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^1 \mathcal{B}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N \in \mathcal{B}_N$, then $(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N) \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 > \varepsilon_N$ and $(\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N) \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 \leq \varepsilon_N$ so that $i \in \mathfrak{I}_+$. The first sum in (5.9) may be restricted to indices i in $\mathfrak{I}_+$.

Analogously, the second sum in (5.9) may be restricted to indices i in $\mathfrak{I}_-$. Therefore, in view of the explicit expression (4.18) of the function V_N, we can rewrite (5.8) as

$$[1+o_N(1)]\,\sqrt{\frac{\alpha N}{2\pi}}\,\frac{1}{N\,Z_N}\sum_{i\in\mathfrak{I}_+\cup\mathfrak{I}_-}\mathfrak{s}(i)\,(\boldsymbol{z}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{v})\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{H}_i}e^{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha N(\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{v})^2}\,,$$

where $\mathfrak{s}(i)=1$ if $i\in\mathfrak{I}_+$ and $\mathfrak{s}(i)=-1$ if $i\in\mathfrak{I}_-$. In this formula, the set $\mathcal{H}_i$, $i\in\mathfrak{I}_+\cup\mathfrak{I}_-$, is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_i \;=\; \begin{cases} \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\cap\mathcal{A}_N:\,\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N\in\mathcal{B}_N,\,\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N\} & \text{if } i\in\mathfrak{I}_+\,,\\ \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\cap\mathcal{A}_N:\,\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N,\,\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\mathcal{B}_N\} & \text{if } i\in\mathfrak{I}_-\,. \end{cases}$$

By Taylor expansion, the previous sum is equal to

$$[1+o_N(1)]\,\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}\,e^{-G(\boldsymbol{0})}}{(2\pi N)^{(d-1)/2}}\,\kappa_N\sum_{i\in\mathfrak{I}_+\cup\mathfrak{I}_-}\mathfrak{s}(i)\,(\boldsymbol{z}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{v})\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{H}_i}e^{-(N/2)\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha vv^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}}\,.$$

Fix $i\in\mathfrak{I}_+$, the argument for $i\in\mathfrak{I}_-$ being analogous. We claim that the set $\mathcal{H}_i$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{H}_i \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N\cap\mathcal{A}_N:\,\varepsilon_N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1<\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\le\varepsilon_N-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\}\,.$$

Since all points $\boldsymbol{y}$ in $\mathcal{B}_N$ are such that $\boldsymbol{y}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\le\varepsilon_N$ and since all points $\boldsymbol{w}$ in $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$ are such that $\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1>\varepsilon_N$, the set $\mathcal{H}_i$ is clearly contained in the set appearing on the right hand side of the previous equality. On the other hand, if a point $\boldsymbol{y}$ belongs to this latter set, $\boldsymbol{y}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1=\varepsilon_N+O(1/N)$. Hence, since $\boldsymbol{y}$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}_N$, $F(\boldsymbol{y})-H\le[1+o_N(1)](1/8)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$. A point $\boldsymbol{y}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N\cap\mathcal{A}_N$ satisfying these two properties is in $\mathcal{B}_N$ if $\boldsymbol{y}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\le\varepsilon_N$ and is in $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$ otherwise. This proves the claim

Finally, we claim that $\mathcal{H}_i=\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$ is the set given by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}_N:\,\varepsilon_N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1<\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\le\varepsilon_N-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\}\,.$$

We have to show that $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i\subset\mathcal{H}_i$, equivalently, that any point in $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$ belongs to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Fix $\boldsymbol{y}\in\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$. Since $\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{A}_N$, $\sum_{2\le j\le d}\lambda_j(\boldsymbol{y}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_j)^2\le(5/4)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$ and, by definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$, $(\boldsymbol{y}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N)\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\le\varepsilon_N$. These two conditions imply that $\boldsymbol{y}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N\in\mathcal{B}_N$ so that $\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$ as claimed.

Recall the definition of the hyperplanes $\mathcal{P}_t$ introduced above equation (4.13). The set $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i$ consists of the points in $\mathcal{A}_N$ which lies between the hyperplanes $-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N+\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon_N}$ and $-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N+\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon_N}$ (cf. Figure 4):

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_i \;=\; \mathcal{A}_N\,\cap\,\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon_N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1}(\boldsymbol{z}_i^N-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N)\,.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 4.4, for $i\in\mathfrak{I}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{(2\pi N)^{(d-1)/2}}&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{H}_i}e^{-(N/2)\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}}\\ &=\;\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{(\boldsymbol{z}_i-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1})\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1}{v_1}\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\,\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{\prod_{k=2}^d\lambda_k}}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Repeating the same argument for $i\in\mathfrak{I}_-$, and since $(\boldsymbol{z}_i-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1})\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1=0$ for $i\notin\mathfrak{I}_-\cup\mathfrak{I}_+$, we obtain that (5.8) is equal to

$$\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{\kappa_N e^{-G(\boldsymbol{0})}}{v_1}\,\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{\prod_{k=2}^d\lambda_k}}\,\sum_{i=1}^L(\boldsymbol{z}_i\cdot\boldsymbol{v})\,(\boldsymbol{z}_i-\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1})\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1\,.$$

By the definition (4.1) of the matrix $\mathbb{A}$ and since $\boldsymbol{u}_1$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{v}$) is an eigenvector of $\mathbb{H}$ (resp. $\mathbb{H}\mathbb{A}^\dagger$) with eigenvalue $-\lambda_1$ (resp. $-\mu$), the last sum can be written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^{L} \boldsymbol{u}_1^\dagger (\boldsymbol{z}_i - \boldsymbol{z}_{i-1})\, \boldsymbol{z}_i^\dagger \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \boldsymbol{u}_1^\dagger \mathbb{A}^\dagger \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; -\,\frac{1}{\lambda_1}\, \boldsymbol{u}_1^\dagger \mathbb{H}\mathbb{A}^\dagger \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \frac{\mu}{\lambda_1} \boldsymbol{u}_1^\dagger \boldsymbol{v} \;=\; \frac{\mu}{\lambda_1}\, v_1 \;.$$

Hence, the penultimate formula becomes

$$\big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \kappa_N e^{-G(\mathbf{0})} \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\prod_{k=1}^d \lambda_k}} \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \kappa_N\, \omega_{\mathbf{0}} \;,$$

which completes the proof of the proposition. □

The divergences along the boundary $\partial^0 \mathcal{B}_N$ is negligible.

Lemma 5.5. *We have that* $\sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^0 \mathcal{B}_N} \big|\, (\mathrm{div}\ \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \,\big| = \kappa_N\, o_N(1)$.

Proof. In view of (5.4) and since $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq H + (1/4)\lambda_1 \varepsilon_N^2$ on $\partial^0 \mathcal{B}_N$, on this set we have that

$$|(\mathrm{div}\ \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})| \leq C_0 Z_N^{-1} e^{-NH} \exp\{-(1/4)\lambda_1 N \varepsilon_N^2\} \;.$$

To complete the proof of the proposition it remains to recall (4.8). □

5.2. **Divergence-free flow.** In this subsection, we transfer the divergence of the flow Φ_N to $\boldsymbol{m}_1^N$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_2^N$.

Definition 5.6. *A sequence* $\{\mathfrak{f}_N : N \geq 1\}$, $\mathfrak{f}_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$, *of flows is said to be negligible if* $\|\mathfrak{f}_N\|^2 \;=\; \kappa_N\, o_N(1)$.

The following proposition is a weaker version of Theorem 5.1.

Proposition 5.7. *There exists a flow* $\widetilde{\Phi}_N$ *which is divergence-free on* $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}^c$, *and such that*

$$\big(\mathrm{div}\, \widetilde{\Phi}_N\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_1^N) \;=\; -\big(\mathrm{div}\, \widetilde{\Phi}_N\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_2^N) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \kappa_N\, \omega_{\mathbf{0}} \;. \tag{5.10}$$

Moreover, $\widetilde{\Phi}_N - \Phi_N$ *is negligible.*

The proof of this proposition relies on the displacement of the divergence of a flow along *good paths*. Fix a constant $C_0 > 0$. A path $\Gamma = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_M) \subset \Xi_N$ with no self-intersections is called a good path connecting $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ to $\boldsymbol{x}_M$ if

- **(P1)** Each edge $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1})$, $0 \leq i < M$, belongs to E_N, where E_N has been introduced in (3.4).
- **(P2)** $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}_k) \leq F_N(\boldsymbol{x}_0) + C_0/N$ for all $0 \leq k \leq M$.

Let $\Gamma = (\boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_M)$ be a good path and let $r \in \mathbb{R}$. Denote by $\chi_{\Gamma,r}$ the flow defined by

$$\chi_{\Gamma,r}(\boldsymbol{x}_k, \boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}) \;=\; r \;=\; -\,\chi_{\Gamma,r}(\boldsymbol{x}_{k+1}, \boldsymbol{x}_k) \;, \quad 0 \leq k < M \;, \tag{5.11}$$

and $\chi_{\Gamma,r}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = 0$, otherwise. The divergence of the flow $\chi_{\Gamma,r}$ vanishes at all points except at $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ and at $\boldsymbol{x}_M$, where $(\mathrm{div}\ \chi_{\Gamma,r})(\boldsymbol{x}_0) = r = -(\mathrm{div}\ \chi_{\Gamma,r})(\boldsymbol{x}_M)$. Therefore, by linearity, if ψ is a flow, the divergence of the flow $\psi + \chi_{\Gamma,r}$ coincides with the one of ψ at all points except at $\boldsymbol{x}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_M$, where it is modified by $\pm r$.

Lemma 5.8. *Consider two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N, and a flow $\psi \in \mathcal{F}_N$. Suppose that for each $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a good path $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ connecting $\boldsymbol{a}$ to a point in $\mathcal{B}$. Denote by L_N the maximal length of these good paths, and assume that each edge of E_N is an edge of at most M_N of these paths. Then, there exists a flow, denoted by $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$, which is divergence-free on $(\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B})^c$, and such that*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\operatorname{div} \chi_{\mathcal{A}})(\boldsymbol{a}) \;&=\; -\,(\operatorname{div} \psi)(\boldsymbol{a})\;, \quad \boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}\;,\\
|(\operatorname{div} \chi_{A})(\boldsymbol{b})| \;&\le\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}} |(\operatorname{div} \psi)(\boldsymbol{a})|\;, \quad \boldsymbol{b}\in\mathcal{B}\;.
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular, the flow $\psi+\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ is divergence-free on $\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, there exists a finite constant C, independent of N, such that

$$
\|\chi_{\mathcal{A}}\|^2 \;\le\; C L_N M_N Z_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}} e^{NF_N(\boldsymbol{a})}\,[(\operatorname{div}\psi)(\boldsymbol{a})]^2\;.
$$

Proof. For each $\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}$, let $\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ be the flow $\chi_{\Gamma,r}$ constructed in (5.11), where Γ is a good path which connects $\boldsymbol{a}$ to a point in $\mathcal{B}$, and $r=-(\operatorname{div}\psi)(\boldsymbol{a})$. Let $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}=\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}}$. The assertions concerning the divergence of $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ follows from the definition of the flows $\chi_{\Gamma,r}$.

We turn to the proof of the last assertion of the lemma. Fix $\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}$, and let $(\boldsymbol{a}=\boldsymbol{x}_0,\boldsymbol{x}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{x}_k=\boldsymbol{b})$ be the good path which connects $\boldsymbol{a}$ to $\mathcal{B}$. By property **(P2)** of good paths and by the fact that $k\le L_N$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}}\|^2 \;&\le\; C\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} Z_N e^{NF_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)}\,[(\operatorname{div}\psi)(\boldsymbol{a})]^2\\
&\le\; C\,L_N\,Z_N\,e^{NF_N(\boldsymbol{a})}\,[(\operatorname{div}\psi)(\boldsymbol{a})]^2\;.
\end{aligned}
$$

Assume that an edge $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\in E_N$ is used by the good paths $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{a}_1},\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{a}_2},\dots,\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{a}_m}$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and since $m\le M_N$,

$$
\big[\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\big]^2 \;=\; \Big(\sum_{i=1}^m \chi_{\boldsymbol{a}_i}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\Big)^2 \;\le\; M_N\sum_{i=1}^m \big[\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}_i}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\big]^2 \;=\; M_N\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\big[\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\big]^2\,.
$$

By dividing this inequality by $c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ and summing over all edges, we obtain that

$$
\|\chi_{\mathcal{A}}\|^2 \;\le\; M_N\sum_{\boldsymbol{a}\in\mathcal{A}}\|\chi_{\boldsymbol{a}}\|^2\;.
$$

Putting together the two previous estimates, we complete the proof of the second assertion of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 5.7. Let

$$
\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_N \;=\; \Big\{\boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi_N :\, |\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_k| < \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_1}{2(d-1)\lambda_k}}\varepsilon_N \text{ for all } 2\le k\le d\Big\} \tag{5.12}
$$

and let $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N=\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_N\cap\mathcal{B}_N$, $\partial^i\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N=\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_N\cap\partial^i\mathcal{B}_N$, $i=1,2$.

The proof is divided in two steps. We first push the divergence of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ into $\partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N\cup\partial^2\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Then, we send all the divergences in $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ to minima $\boldsymbol{m}_1^N$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_2^N$ of $\mathcal{E}_N^1$ and $\mathcal{E}_N^2$, respectively. This procedure is visualized in Figure 5.

Step 1. Transfer of the divergences of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ into $\partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N\cup\partial^2\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$. We start by introducing the good paths connecting points in $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ to points in $\partial^i\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $i=1,2$.



[Step 1] [Step 2]

FIGURE 5. Transferring the divergence of the flow Φ_N from $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$ to $\mathcal{E}_N^1 \cup \mathcal{E}_N^2$

Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 \geq 0$. Consider the line $l_{\boldsymbol{x}} = \{\boldsymbol{x} + t\boldsymbol{u}_1 : 0 \leq t \leq \varepsilon_N\}$, and let $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}} = (\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_m \in \partial^1 \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N)$ be a path such that

(a) The edge $(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_{i+1})$ belongs to E_N for all $0 \leq i < m$;
(b) $\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{x}_i, l_{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq C_0/N$ for all $0 \leq i < m$;
(c) $m \leq C_0 N \varepsilon_N$

for some finite constant C_0 independent of N. Since $\boldsymbol{u_1}$ is a decreasing direction of F, there exists a finite constant C_0 such that $F_N(\boldsymbol{y}) \leq F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) + C_0/N$ for all $\boldsymbol{y} \in l_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. Hence, in view of (a) and (b) , $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is a good path for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$.

Denote by χ_N the flow $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ given by Lemma 5.8 for $\mathcal{A} := \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $\mathcal{B} := \partial^1 \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N \cup \partial^2 \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $\psi = \Phi_N$, and good paths $\{\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}} : \boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N\}$. By construction, $L_N \leq C_0 N \varepsilon_N$. We can observe from (b) that a path $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, visit $\boldsymbol{y}$ only if $\mathrm{dist}(\boldsymbol{y}, l_{\boldsymbol{x}}) \leq C_0/N$. From this observation, it is clear that there are at most $C_0 N \varepsilon_N$ paths visiting $\boldsymbol{y}$. This implies $M_N \leq C_0 N \varepsilon_N$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.8, $\widehat{\Phi}_N = \Phi_N + \chi_N$ is divergence-free on $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ and

$$\big\|\chi_N\big\|^2 \;\leq\; C_0\, N^2\, \varepsilon_N^2\, Z_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N} e^{N F_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \big[(\mathrm{div}\ \Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \,.$$

By (5.5), by a Taylor expansion of $F_N(\boldsymbol{x})$, and by Lemma 4.3, this expression is less than or equal to

$$C_0 Z_N^{-1} e^{-NH} N \varepsilon_N^6 \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{B}_N} e^{-\frac{N}{2} \boldsymbol{x}^\dagger (\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger) \boldsymbol{x}} \;\leq\; C_0 Z_N^{-1} e^{-NH} N^{\frac{d}{2}+1}\, \varepsilon_N^6 \,.$$

Therefore, by (4.7),

$$\|\chi_N\|^2 \;\leq\; C_0 \kappa_N N^2\, \varepsilon_N^6 \;=\; \kappa_N o_N(1) \,, \tag{5.13}$$

and hence χ_N is a negligible flow.

Step 2. Transfer of the divergences of $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ to local minima of W_1 and W_2. Fix, without loss of generality, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ such that $\boldsymbol{x} \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_1 \geq 0$.

We first claim that there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$e^{N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\big[(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; \frac{1}{Z_N^2}\, e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N} \tag{5.14}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$. We consider three cases, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{B}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$.

Assume first that $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{B}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N = \mathcal{B}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{C}}_N$ and recall from Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha \boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger$ is a positive-definite matrix. By (5.5), and by a Taylor expansion of $F_N(\boldsymbol{x})$,

$$e^{N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\big[(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; C_0 \frac{\varepsilon_N^4}{N\, Z_N^2}\, e^{-\frac{N}{2}\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger(\mathbb{H}+2\alpha\boldsymbol{v}\boldsymbol{v}^\dagger)\boldsymbol{x}} \;\le\; C_0\, \frac{1}{Z_N^2}\, e^{-\frac{N}{2}\tau|\boldsymbol{x}|^2}\;,$$

where $\tau > 0$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{H} + 2\alpha v v^\dagger$. To complete the proof of (5.14) for points $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the set $\mathcal{B}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, it remains to observe from (5.12) that for $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\mathcal{B}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$,

$$|\boldsymbol{x}|^2 \;\ge\; \varepsilon_N^2 \min_{2\le k\le d} \Big\{ \frac{\lambda_1}{2(d-1)\lambda_k} \Big\}\,.$$

Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$. By (5.4), $|(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})| \le C_0(1/Z_N)\exp\{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})\}$. In particular, (5.14) follows from the fact that $F(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge H + (1/4)\lambda_1\varepsilon_N^2$ for $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$.

Finally, fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$. By (5.3),

$$(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \frac{1}{Z_N}\sum_i e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)}\big\{V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big\}\,,$$

where the sum is performed over all indices i for which $\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Expressing the difference $V_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)$ as $[1 - V_N(\boldsymbol{x})] + [V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N) - 1]$, by Young's inequality,

$$\big[(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; \frac{C_0}{Z_N^2}\sum_i e^{-2N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)}\Big\{[1-V_N(\boldsymbol{x})]^2+[1-V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)]^2\Big\}\,.$$

Since the sum is carried over indices i for which $\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N$, and since $\exp\{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\} \le C_0\exp\{-NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})\}$, by Lemma 4.7,

$$\big[(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; \frac{C_0}{Z_N^2}\, e^{-N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\, e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N}\;,$$

for some $a > 0$, which completes the proof of assertion (5.14).

We next claim that there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$e^{N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\big[(\text{div }\chi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; C_0\, \frac{1}{Z_N^2}\, e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N} \tag{5.15}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N \cup \partial^2\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$.

Fix a point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N \cup \partial^2\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$. By Lemmata 5.3 and 5.8,

$$|(\text{div }\chi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})| \;\le\; \sum_{z\in\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N} |(\text{div }\Phi_N)(\boldsymbol{z})| \;=\; \kappa_N o_N(1)\,. \tag{5.16}$$

By (5.12), each point $\boldsymbol{x}$ in $\partial^1\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N \cup \partial^2\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{x} \;=\; \Big(\pm\big[1+o_N(1)\big]\boldsymbol{u}_1 + \sum_{k=2}^d x_k\boldsymbol{u}_k\Big)\,\varepsilon_N\;,$$

where $x_k^2 \le \lambda_1/[2(d-1)\lambda_k]$, $2 \le k \le d$. Therefore, by Taylor's expansion,

$$F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) - H \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\boldsymbol{x}^\dagger \mathbb{H} \boldsymbol{x} \,+\, O(\varepsilon_N^3) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\,\Big(-\lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^d x_k^2\,\lambda_k \Big) \varepsilon_N^2 \,+\, O(\varepsilon_N^3)$$

$$\le\; \frac{1}{2}\,\Big(-\lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^d \frac{\lambda_1}{2(d-1)} \Big)\, \varepsilon_N^2 \,+\, O(\varepsilon_N^3) \;=\; -\,\frac{\lambda_1}{4} \varepsilon_N^2 \,+\, O(\varepsilon_N^3)\,.$$

By the previous estimates, since $N\epsilon_N^3 \downarrow 0$ and since $\exp\{-aN\varepsilon_N^2\}$ vanishes faster than any polynomial,

$$e^{N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\,\big[(\mathrm{div}\;\chi_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; C_0\,\kappa_N^2\,e^{2NH}\,e^{-(\lambda_1/4)N\varepsilon_N^2} \;<\; C_0\,\frac{1}{Z_N^2}\,e^{-(\lambda_1/8)N\varepsilon_N^2}\,,$$

which completes the proof of assertion (5.15).

By definition of the flow $\widehat{\Phi}_N$ and by (5.14) and (5.15), there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$e^{N[F_N(\boldsymbol{x})+H]}\big[(\mathrm{div}\;\widehat{\Phi}_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2 \;\le\; \frac{1}{Z_N^2}\,e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N}\;,\; \forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N\,. \tag{5.17}$$

We are now in a position to move the divergence of $\widehat{\Phi}_N$ from $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ to the minima of W_1 and W_2.

Fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$ and let $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ be the solution of the ODE

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{x}}(t) \;=\; -\nabla F(\boldsymbol{x}(t))\,,\;\; \boldsymbol{x}(0) \;=\; \boldsymbol{x}\,.$$

Since we assumed that $\boldsymbol{x}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_1 \ge 0$, this path connects $\boldsymbol{x}$ to a local minima of W_1^ϵ. Let $T = \inf\{\, t>0 : \boldsymbol{x}(t) \in \overline{W}_1^\epsilon\,\} < \infty$, and let $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(1)} = \{\boldsymbol{x}(t) : 0 \le t \le T\}$. Since $\overline{W}_1^\epsilon$ is connected, there is a continuous path $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(2)} \subset \overline{W}_1^\epsilon$ connecting $\boldsymbol{x}(T)$ to $\boldsymbol{m}_1$. Note that $F(\boldsymbol{y}) \le H - \epsilon$ for all $\boldsymbol{y} \in \theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(2)}$. Appending $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(2)}$ to $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(1)}$ at $\boldsymbol{x}(T)$, we obtain a continuous path $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ connecting $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_1$. Let $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}} = (\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_0, \boldsymbol{x}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{x}_m = \boldsymbol{m}_1^N)$ be the path connecting $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{m}_1^N$, obtained by discretizing $\theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, as in step 1. It is obvious that $F(\boldsymbol{y}) \le F(\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $\boldsymbol{y} \in \theta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, so that $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is a good path.

Apply Lemma 5.8 with $\mathcal{A} = \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N$, $\mathcal{B} = \{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}$, $\psi = \widehat{\Phi}_N$ and good paths $\{\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}} : \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \setminus \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N\}$. As $M_N \le C_0 N^d$ and $L_N \le C_0 N^d$, if we represent by $\widetilde{\chi}_N$ the flow denoted by $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}$ in Lemma 5.8, by the assertion of this lemma and by (5.17),

$$\|\widetilde{\chi}_N\|^2 \;\le\; C_0\,N^{2d}\,Z_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N\setminus\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_N} e^{NF_N(\boldsymbol{x})}\big[(\mathrm{div}\;\widehat{\Phi}_N)(\boldsymbol{x})\big]^2$$

$$\le\; C_0\,e^{-NH}\,\frac{N^{2d}}{Z_N}\,|\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N|\,e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N} \;=\; C_0\,\kappa_N\,N^{(3d/2)+1}\,e^{-a\varepsilon_N^2 N} \;=\; \kappa_N\,o_N(1)\,.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\chi}_N$ is negligible.

Let $R_N = \chi_N + \widetilde{\chi}_N$. By construction, the flow $\Phi_N + R_N$ is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}^c$, and R_N is negligible since both of χ_N and $\widetilde{\chi}_N$ are negligible.

It suffices to check (5.10) to complete the proof. By the first assertion of Lemma 5.2, and by Lemmata 5.3 and 5.5, the divergence of the flow Φ_N is negligible on $\Xi_N \setminus (\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N)$. Since the path $\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ connects $\partial^i\mathcal{B}_N$ to $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$, $i = 1, 2$, the divergences on $\partial^i\mathcal{B}_N$ is transferred to $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$. Therefore, by Proposition 5.4, we can conclude (5.10).

□

5.3. **Flows for the adjoint dynamics.** We introduce in this subsection the flows which approximate the flow $\Phi_{V_N^*}$ in $\mathcal{B}_N$. For $\boldsymbol{z} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$ and a function $f : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$, define a flow $\Phi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}$, supported on $\gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N$, by

$$\Phi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; f(\boldsymbol{x})c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) - f(\boldsymbol{y})c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})\;, \quad \boldsymbol{x}\,,\,\boldsymbol{y} \in \Xi_N\;.$$

Let Φ_N^* be the flow defined by

$$\Phi_N^* \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} \Phi_{V_N^*,\boldsymbol{z}}\;, \tag{5.18}$$

where V_N^* is the approximation of the equilibrium potential introduced in Subsection 4.4.

All results presented in Subsections 5.1, 5.2 for the flow Φ_N are in force for Φ_N^*, replacing $\mathcal{L}_N$, V_N by $\mathcal{L}_N^*$, V_N^*, respectively. In particular, there exists a flow $\widetilde{\Phi}_N^*$ which is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}^c$, such that

$$\big(\operatorname{div}\widetilde{\Phi}_N^*\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_1^N) \;=\; -\big(\operatorname{div}\widetilde{\Phi}_N^*\big)(\boldsymbol{m}_2^N) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\;, \tag{5.19}$$

and such that $\widetilde{\Phi}_N^* - \Phi_N^*$ is negligible.

5.4. **Final corrections on $\widetilde{\Phi}_N$.** In this subsection, we remove the $o_N(1)$ terms in (5.10). The following elementary lemma is useful in the forthcoming computations.

Lemma 5.9. *Suppose that the sequence of flows $\mathfrak{f}_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$ is negligible. Then, for any sequence of flows $\mathfrak{h}_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$,*

$$\|\mathfrak{h}_N + \mathfrak{f}_N\|^2 \;\le\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\|\mathfrak{h}_N\|^2 \;+\; \kappa_N\,o_N(1)\;.$$

Next result provides a lower bound for the capacity $\operatorname{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$.

Lemma 5.10. *We have that*

$$\operatorname{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}) \;\ge\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\;.$$

Proof. By Theorem 3.3, it suffices to find $g_N \in \mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$ and $\psi_N \in \mathfrak{U}_1(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$ satisfying

$$\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\,\|\Phi_{g_N} - \psi_N\|^2 \;=\; 1+o_N(1)\;. \tag{5.20}$$

Let ψ_N and g_N be the flow and the function given by

$$\psi_N \;=\; \frac{1+c_N}{\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}}\,\frac{\widetilde{\Phi}_N + \widetilde{\Phi}_N^*}{2}\;, \quad g_N \;=\; \frac{1+c_N}{\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}}\,W_N\;,$$

where $c_N = o_N(1)$ is the normalizing sequence which guarantees that ψ_N is a unitary flow, and where W_N is the function defined by $(V_N^* - V_N)/2$ on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$ and 0 otherwise. By definition, the flow ψ_N belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_1(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$ and the function g_N belongs to $\mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$. It remains to show that (5.20) holds.

By Proposition 5.7, by (5.19) and by Lemma 5.9,

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\,\|\Phi_{g_N} - \psi_N\|^2 \;&=\; \frac{1+o_N(1)}{\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}}\,\Big\|\Phi_{W_N} - \frac{\widetilde{\Phi}_N + \widetilde{\Phi}_N^*}{2}\Big\|^2 \\
&=\; \frac{1+o_N(1)}{\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}}\,\Big\|\Phi_{W_N} - \frac{\Phi_N + \Phi_N^*}{2}\Big\|^2 + o_N(1)\;.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Define the outer boundary of $\mathcal{B}_N$ as

$$\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N \;=\; \{\boldsymbol{z} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N \setminus \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N : \gamma_{\boldsymbol{z}}^N \cap \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N \neq \varnothing\}\;.$$

With this notation,

$$\Phi_{W_N} \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} \Phi_{(V_N^*-V_N)/2,\boldsymbol{z}} \;+\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N} \Phi_{W_N,\boldsymbol{z}}\;.$$

Therefore, by the definitions (5.2), (5.18) of the flows Φ_N, Φ_N^*,

$$\Phi_{W_N} \;-\; \frac{1}{2}\big(\Phi_N+\Phi_N^*\big) \;=\; -\sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N} \Psi_{V_N,\boldsymbol{z}} \;+\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N} \Phi_{W_N,\boldsymbol{z}}\;,$$

where $\Psi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}} = [\Phi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}} + \Phi^*_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}]/2$. Denote the first term on the right hand side by $\Psi_N^{(1)}$ and the second one by $\Psi_N^{(2)}$. By the definition of $\Psi_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}$ and by Proposition 4.8,

$$\big\|\Psi_N^{(1)}\big\|^2 \;=\; \mathcal{D}_N(V_N;\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\kappa_N\,\omega_{\mathbf{0}}\;.$$

Therefore, in view of (5.21), to conclude the proof of the lemma it remains to show that $\Psi_N^{(2)}$ is a negligible flow.

By the definition of $\Phi_{f,z}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_N^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} c_{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\,W_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N\,,\,\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\}\\ &\quad-\;\sum_{i=0}^{L-1} c_{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})\,W_N(\boldsymbol{y})\,\mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N\,,\,\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i-1}^N-\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\}\;.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Schwarz inequality and since $c_{\boldsymbol{z}}(\boldsymbol{w},\boldsymbol{w}') \le 2\,c^s(\boldsymbol{w},\boldsymbol{w}')$ for all $\boldsymbol{z}$, $\boldsymbol{w}$, $\boldsymbol{w}'$,

$$\|\Psi_N^{(2)}\|^2 \;\le\; C_0\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N} c_{\boldsymbol{x}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N,\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)\,W_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)^2\;.$$

By definition of W_N and by the bound (3.2) on the conductances, this expression is less than or equal to

$$\frac{C_0}{Z_N}\sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N} e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{x})}\,[V_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)-V_N^*(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)]^2\,\mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N\}\;.$$

The last indicator appeared because W_N vanishes outside $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N$. Since $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs to $\overline{\partial}\mathcal{B}_N$, $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\notin\mathcal{B}_N$ for $0\le i<L$. We may therefore replace the indicator appearing in the previous formula by the indicator of the set $\{\boldsymbol{x}:\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N\in\partial\mathcal{B}_N\}$. Therefore, by performing the change of variables $\boldsymbol{y}=\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$, we obtain that

$$\|\Psi_N^{(2)}\|^2 \;\le\; \frac{C_0}{Z_N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\partial\mathcal{B}_N} e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{y})}\,[V_N(\boldsymbol{y})-V_N^*(\boldsymbol{y})]^2\;.$$

To show that this expression is of order $o_N(1)\kappa_N$, we consider separately each part of the boundary $\partial\mathcal{B}_N$. For $\boldsymbol{y}\in\partial^0\mathcal{B}_N$, since $|V_N^*-V_N|\le 1$,

$$e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{y})}[(V_N^*-V_N)(\boldsymbol{y})]^2 \;\le\; C\,e^{-NH}\,e^{-\frac{1}{4}\lambda_1 N\varepsilon_N^2}\;.$$

For $\boldsymbol{y}\in\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and by Lemma 4.7,

$$\begin{aligned}e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{y})}[(V_N^*-V_N)(\boldsymbol{y})]^2 \;&\le\; 2e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{y})}\big([1-V_N(\boldsymbol{y})]^2+[1-V_N^*(\boldsymbol{y})]^2\big)\\ &\le\; C_0\,e^{-NH}\,e^{-c_0N\varepsilon_N^2}\end{aligned}$$

for some $c_0 > 0$. An analogously argument applies to $\boldsymbol{y} \in \partial^2 \mathcal{B}_N$. It follows from the last three estimates that there exists $a > 0$ such that

$$\|\Psi_N^{(2)}\|^2 \;\le\; C\kappa_N N^{-\frac{d}{2}-1} e^{-aN\varepsilon_N^2} \;.$$

This shows that $\Psi_N^{(2)}$ is a negligible flows and completes the proof of the lemma. □

The lower bound presented in the previous lemma is sharp if there are only two metastable sets $\mathcal{E}_N^1$, $\mathcal{E}_N^2$ and only one saddle point between them. It is not sharp otherwise, as shall be seen in the next section.

Let $\mathrm{cap}_N^s(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the capacity with respect to the process generated by $\mathcal{L}_N^s$. Then, by Lemma 3.1 and by [11, Lemma 2.6], for any disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N,

$$\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}) \le 4\,L^2\,\mathrm{cap}_N^s(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}) \;. \tag{5.22}$$

Lemma 5.11. *For any sequence $\delta_N \downarrow 0$, there exists a negligible flow $\varrho_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$ which is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N, \boldsymbol{m}_2^N\}^c$ and such that*

$$(\mathrm{div}\,\varrho_N)\,(\boldsymbol{m}_1^N) \;=\; -\,(\mathrm{div}\,\varrho_N)\,(\boldsymbol{m}_2^N) \;=\; \kappa_N\delta_N \;.$$

Proof. By the Thomson principle for the reversible process generated by $\mathcal{L}_N^s$, there is a unit flow $\widetilde{\varrho}_N \in \mathfrak{U}_1(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})$ such that

$$\|\widetilde{\varrho}_N\|^2 \;=\; \frac{1}{\mathrm{cap}_N^s(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})} \;\le\; \frac{4\,L^2}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}_1^N\},\{\boldsymbol{m}_2^N\})} \;\le\; C\,\kappa_N^{-1} \;,$$

where we used (5.22) and Lemma 5.10 to obtain the last two inequalities. Therefore, $\varrho_N \;=\; \kappa_N\delta_N\widetilde{\varrho}_N$ fulfils all the requirements of the lemma. □

By adding the flow ϱ_N to the flow $\widetilde{\Phi}_N$ introduced in Proposition 5.7 we obtain a new flow whose divergences at $\boldsymbol{m}_1^N$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_2^N$ are exactly equal to $\pm\kappa_N\omega_{\mathbf{0}}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 5.1.

6. Computation of Capacities

We prove in this section a special case of Theorem 2.1. More precisely, we are concentrating on the case $A = \{i\}$, $B = S\setminus\{i\}$, $i \in S$. In this case, there is no ambiguity in the constructions of the approximations of equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}$ and the flow $\Phi_{V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}}$ and it is very clear how to use the building blocks that we obtained so far. In the next section, based on the argument of the current section, we prove Theorem 2.1 for general A and B.

Define $\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^i = \mathcal{E}_N(S\setminus\{i\})$. Since it is obvious that $\mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\},S\setminus\{i\}) = \sum_{k=1}^M \omega_{i,k}$, the following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.1. *For every $1 \le i \le M$,*

$$\frac{Z_N}{(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}}\,e^{NH}\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i,\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^i) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\sum_{k=1}^M \omega_{i,k} \;. \tag{6.1}$$

The proof of this result is based on the construction of an approximation, denoted by h_N, of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1}$, and of an approximation, denoted by Υ_N, of the flow $\Phi^*_{V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1}}$. Identical arguments, left to the reader, permit to define approximations of the equilibrium potential $V^*_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1}$ and of the flow $\Phi_{V^*_{\mathcal{E}_N^1,\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1}}$. We assume throughout this section, without loss of generality, that $i = 1$ in the statement of Theorem 6.1.



FIGURE 6. The sets $\mathcal{W}_N^i$, $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ and $\mathcal{X}_N$. Note that the sets $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ are thicker than the sets $\mathcal{W}_N^i$ because the formers are defined by the bound $F(\boldsymbol{x}) \le \lambda_1^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\varepsilon_N^2/4$, while the latters are defined by the bound $F(\boldsymbol{x}) \le \lambda\varepsilon_N^2/4$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ be a saddle point in $\mathfrak{S}_{1,j}$, $j \neq 1$. All sets, functions and flows introduced in the previous sections are represented in this section with an extra upper index $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ to specify the saddle point. For example, we denote by $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, $\mathcal{C}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ the mesoscopic neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ defined in (4.11) and (4.9).

For a saddle point $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}$, denote by $-\lambda_1^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ the negative eigenvalue of (Hess F)($\boldsymbol{\sigma}$) and let $\lambda = \min_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}} \lambda_1^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$,

$$\Omega_N \;=\; \big\{\boldsymbol{z} \in \Xi :\, F(\boldsymbol{z}) \;\le\; H + (1/4)\lambda\,\varepsilon_N^2\big\}\;.$$

In view of (4.10), denote by W_N^1, W_N^2, …, W_N^M the connected components of $\Omega_N \setminus \big(\bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}} \mathcal{C}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\big)$ such that $W_i^\epsilon \subset W_N^i$, $1 \le i \le M$, and let $\mathcal{W}_N^i = W_N^i \cap \Xi_N$. Note that $\mathcal{E}_N^i \subset \mathcal{W}_N^i$ by definition. Let $\mathcal{X}_N$ be the outer region:

$$\mathcal{X}_N \;=\; \Xi_N \setminus \Big(\bigcup_{k=1}^M \mathcal{W}_N^k \bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}} \mathcal{B}_N^{\sigma}\Big)\,.$$

We refer to Figure 6 for an illustration of these sets.

Let $\mathfrak{S}_1 = \bigcup_{2\le k\le M} \mathfrak{S}_{1,k}$, and denote by h_N the approximations of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1}$ given by

$$h_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \begin{cases} 1 & \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{W}_N^1 \\ V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}) & \boldsymbol{x} \in \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\, \boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 6.2. *Recall from* (2.10) *the definition of* $\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. *Then,*

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\;.$$

Proof. Decompose $\mathcal{D}_N(h_N)$ into

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \mathcal{D}_N(h_N;\, \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \;+\; \mathcal{D}_N(h_N;\, \mathcal{R}_N)\,,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_N = \widehat{\Xi}_N \setminus (\bigcup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})$. Since h_N coincides with $V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, by Proposition 4.8, for each $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ in $\mathfrak{S}_1$,

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N;\, \mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\,.$$

To complete the proof of the lemma, it remains to show that

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N;\mathcal{R}_N) \;=\; \kappa_N\, o_N(1)\,. \tag{6.2}$$

The argument presented below to prove this assertion will be used several times in the remaining part of this article. For this reason, we present very carefully each step.

By (3.1) and (4.20), $\mathcal{D}_N(h_N;\mathcal{R}_N)$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2Z_N} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N} e^{-N\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x})} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \big[h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) - h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big]^2 \\
&\quad=\; \frac{\kappa_N}{2(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N} e^{N(H-\overline{F}_N(\boldsymbol{x}))} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} \big[h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) - h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)\big]^2\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

In the previous sum, we may restrict our attention to the points $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N$ such that $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$ because, as h_N is bounded by 1, the contribution of the terms $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N$ such that $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \ge H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$ is of order $\kappa_N o_N(1)$ by definition of ε_N.

To estimate the remaining sum, fix $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N$ and $0\le i<L$. Assume first that $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1$. To fix ideas suppose that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{1,2}$. As $\boldsymbol{x}$ is an element of $\mathcal{R}_N$, it does not belong to $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Thus $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_j^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ for all $0\le j<L$. In particular, $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \notin \mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ so that $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. The point $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ can not belong to $\partial^0\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ because, by (4.12), points $\boldsymbol{y}$ in this set are such that $F_N(\boldsymbol{y}) \ge H + (1/4)\lambda_1^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\varepsilon_N^2 - C_0/N$ and we already assumed that $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$.

Suppose, to fix ideas, that $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. The argument in the case $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ is analogous. As $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$, $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ or to $\mathcal{W}_N^1$.

Consider first the case where $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Recall the arguments presented in the penultimate paragraph which led to the conclusion that $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ belongs to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Applied to $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ this reasoning permits to conclude that this point belongs to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \cup \partial^2\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Since, by assumption, $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, we also have that $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$.

As $h_N = V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ on $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N) = V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)$ and $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) = V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N)$. Since both points belong to $\partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, we may apply Lemma 4.7 to conclude that the sum on the right hand side of (6.3) restricted to points $\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{R}_N$ and indices $0\le i<L$ satisfying the new set of conditions is of order $\kappa_N o_N(1)$.

Consider now the case where $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ belongs to $\mathcal{W}_N^1$. In consequence, $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) = 1$. Since $\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N \in \partial^1\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ and $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N) = V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N)$, we may also apply Lemma 4.7 to conclude that the sum on the right hand side of (6.3) restricted

to points $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{R}_N$ and indices $0 \le i < L$ satisfying all the above conditions is of order $\kappa_N o_N(1)$.

By symmetry, the previous argument applies also to the case where $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ for some $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1$. It remains therefore to consider the case in which $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_i^N$ and $\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N$ do not belong to $\cup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, and $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$. For such points h_N is equal to 0 or 1, and the only possible contribution occurs if $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_i^N) = 1$ and $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{z}_{i+1}^N) = 0$, or the contrary. These identities imply that the point $\boldsymbol{x}$ is close to the boundary of $\mathcal{W}_N^1$, but the only part of the boundary of $\mathcal{W}_N^1$ in which $F_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \le H + (1/8)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2$ is the one with $\cup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ which has already been examined. This completes the proof of (6.2) and the one of the lemma. □

The next step consists in defining a flow, denoted below by Υ_N, which approximates $\Phi^*_{h_N}$. Denote by $\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_N^i$ the core of $\mathcal{W}_N^i$. Define the flows $\Upsilon_N \in \mathcal{F}_N$ as

$$\Upsilon_N \;=\; \Upsilon_N^1 \;+\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;,$$

where the flows $\widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ have been introduced in Theorem 5.1, and where

$$\Upsilon_N^1 = \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_N^1} \Phi^*_{1,\boldsymbol{z}} \;.$$

The flow $\Phi^*_{1,\boldsymbol{z}}$ is obtained by taking f as a constant function $f \equiv 1$ at $\Phi^*_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}$. The flow Υ_N^1 has been added to take into account the fact that $h_N = 1$ on the set $\mathcal{W}_N^1$.

Lemma 6.3. *The flow Υ_N is divergence-free on $(\mathcal{E}_N)^c$ and satisfy*

$$(\operatorname{div}\Upsilon_N)(\mathcal{E}_N^1) \;=\; -\,(\operatorname{div}\Upsilon_N)(\breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1) \;=\; \kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;.$$

Furthermore, $\Upsilon_N - \Phi^*_{h_N}$ is a negligible flow.

Proof. Since the conductance is constant over each cycle, the flow Υ_N^1 is divergence-free. Furthermore, since the divergence functional is additive, the first assertion of the lemma follows from Theorem 5.1.

By Theorem 5.1, to prove that $\Upsilon_N - \Phi^*_{h_N}$ is a negligible flow, it is enough to show that $\Upsilon_N^1 + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \Phi_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} - \Phi^*_{h_N}$ is negligible. By (5.2), this difference is equal to

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_N^1} \Phi^*_{1,\boldsymbol{z}} \;+\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_1} \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \Phi^*_{\boldsymbol{z},V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \;-\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\widehat{\Xi}_N} \Phi^*_{\boldsymbol{z},h_N} \;.$$

Since $h_N = V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ on $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, $h_N = 1$ on $\mathcal{W}_N^1$, and $h_N = 0$ on the complement of these sets, the unique edges which survive in this difference belong to the boundary of these sets. At the boundary of these sets, the function F_N is bounded below by $H + (1/4)\lambda\varepsilon_N^2 - C/N$, and we may repeat the arguments presented in the proof of Lemma 6.2 to show that the flow appearing in the previous displayed formula is negligible. □

Proof of Theorem 6.1. We start by proving the upper bound of the capacity. Define

$$f_N \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(h_N^* + h_N) \;, \quad \phi_N \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(\Upsilon_N^* - \Upsilon_N) \;.$$

By definition of h_N, h_N^*, the function f_N belongs to $\mathfrak{C}_{1,0}(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1)$. By Lemma 6.3, the flow ϕ_N belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_0(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1)$, and the flow $\phi_N - \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{h_N^*} - \Phi^*_{h_N})$ is negligible. Therefore, by Lemma 5.9,

$$\|\Phi_{f_N} - \phi_N\|^2 \;\le\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \Big\| \Phi_{\frac{1}{2}(h_N^* + h_N)} - \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{h_N^*} - \Phi^*_{h_N}) \Big\|^2 \;+\; \kappa_N \, o_N(1) \;.$$

The flow appearing in this formula is equal to $(1/2)\{\Phi_{h_N} + \Phi^*_{h_N}\}$. Hence, by the explicit expression of these flows and of the flow norm, the previous expression is equal to

$$\big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \mathcal{D}_N(h_N) \;+\; \kappa_N \, o_N(1) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;, \tag{6.4}$$

where we applied Lemma 6.2 to derive the last identity. To complete the proof of the upper bound, it remains to apply Theorem 3.2 to obtain that

$$\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1) \;\le\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;.$$

To prove the converse inequality, let g_N and ψ_N be given by

$$g_N \;=\; \frac{1}{\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \, \frac{h_N^* - h_N}{2} \;, \quad \psi_N \;=\; \frac{1}{\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \, \frac{\Upsilon_N^* + \Upsilon_N}{2} \;,$$

As above, by definition of h_N, h_N^*, the function g_N belongs to $\mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1)$, and by Lemma 6.3, the flow ϕ_N belongs to $\mathfrak{U}_1(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1)$.

By Lemmata 6.2 and 5.9,

$$\Big(\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\Big)^2 \, \|\Phi_{g_N} - \psi_N\|^2 \;\le\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \Big\| \Phi_{\frac{h_N^* - h_N}{2}} - \frac{\Phi_{h_N^*} + \Phi^*_{h_N}}{2} \Big\|^2 + \kappa_N \, o_N(1) \;.$$

The flow appearing on the right hand side is equal to $-(1/2)(\Phi_{h_N} + \Phi^*_{h_N})$. Hence, by (6.4), the previous expression is equal to $[1 + o_N(1)]\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ so that

$$\Big(\kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\Big) \, \|\Phi_{g_N} - \psi_N\|^2 \;\le\; 1 \,+\, o_N(1) \;.$$

Finally, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \breve{\mathcal{E}}_N^1) \;\ge\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big] \, \kappa_N \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}_1} \omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;,$$

which completes the proof of the theorem.

7. Proof of Theorem 2.1

Recall the definition of the Markov chain $Y(t)$ introduced just above the statement of Theorem 2.1. The generator of $Y(t)$, denoted by $\mathcal{L}_Y$, is given by

$$(\mathcal{L}_Y f)(i) \;=\; \sum_{j \in S} \frac{\omega_{i,j}}{\overline{\omega}_i} [f(j) - f(i)]$$

for each function $f : S \to \mathbb{R}$. The associated Dirichlet form with respect to the equilibrium measure μ is given by

$$\mathcal{D}_Y(f) \;=\; \langle f, -\mathcal{L}_Y f \rangle_\mu \;=\; \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in S} \omega_{i,j} \, [f(j) - f(i)]^2 \;.$$

For disjoint subsets A, B of S, denote by $q_{A,B}$ the equilibrium potential between A and B:

$$q_{A,B}(k) \;=\; \mathbf{P}_k^Y[H_A < H_B]\,.$$

We review some well-known properties of the equilibrium potential needed below. The first property is that the capacity between A and B is given by the Dirichlet form of $q_{A,B}$:

$$\mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;=\; \mathcal{D}_Y(q_{A,B})\,. \tag{7.1}$$

Recall that the equilibrium potential can be characterized as the solution of discrete elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} (\mathcal{L}_Y q_{A,B})(k) \;=\; 0 & k \in S\setminus(A\cup B)\,,\\ q_{A,B}(k) \;=\; 1 & k\in A\,,\\ q_{A,B}(k) \;=\; 0 & k\in B\,, \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

which reduces to a linear equation of dimension $M - |A\cup B|$. By using (7.2), we can rewrite (7.1) as

$$\mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;=\; -\sum_{a\in A}\mu(a)\,(\mathcal{L}_Y q_{A,B})(a) \;=\; \sum_{b\in B}\mu(b)\,(\mathcal{L}_Y q_{A,B})(b)\,. \tag{7.3}$$

7.1. **Approximation of the equilibrium potential $V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}$.** Fix two disjoint subsets A, B of S. The main difficulty of the proof of Theorem 2.1 consists in constructing a good approximation of the equilibrium potential between $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$. If $A\cup B\neq S$, this construction requires a more refined analysis than the one presented in the previous section, as we have to find the correct value of the approximation of equilibrium potential at the sets $\mathcal{E}_N^i$, $i\notin A\cup B$. This value is related to the equilibrium potential of the process Y between A and B, as evidenced below. We present the arguments for $V_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}$, as the ones for $V^*_{\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)}$ are analogous.

For $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}$, $i<j$, denote by $V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, the approximation, introduced in Section 4, of $V_{\mathcal{E}_N^i,\mathcal{E}_N^j}$, the equilibrium potential between $\mathcal{E}_N^i$ and $\mathcal{E}_N^j$, in the mesoscopic neighborhood $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. For a function $q:S\to\mathbb{R}$, define the function $h_N^q:\Xi_N\to\mathbb{R}$ by

$$h_N^q(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \begin{cases} q(i) & \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{W}_N^i\,,\\ [q(i)-q(j)]V_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}(\boldsymbol{x})+q(j) & \boldsymbol{x}\in\overline{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}},\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j},\ i<j\,,\\ 0 & \text{otherwise}\,. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 7.1. *For any function $q:S\to\mathbb{R}$, we have that*

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\mathcal{D}_Y(q)\,.$$

Proof. Write $\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q)$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}}\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q;\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \;+\; \mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q;\widehat{\Xi}_N\setminus\cup_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}}\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}})\,.$$

By the proof of Lemma 6.2, the second term is bounded by $\kappa_N\,o_N(1)$. On the other hand, for each $i<j$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}$, by Proposition 4.8,

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q;\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\,[q(i)-q(j)]^2\,.$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\sum_{1\le i<j\le M}\sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}}\omega_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\,[q(i)-q(j)]^2 \;+\; \kappa_N\,o_N(1)\,,$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. □

In view of the previous result, to minimize $\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^q)$ among all functions which vanish at $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$ and which are equal to 1 at $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$, we have to choose q as the equilibrium potential between A and B for the random walk $Y(t)$.

Recall from Theorem 5.1 the definition of the flows $\widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}$. For each function $q : S \to \mathbb{R}$, define the flow Υ_N^q which approximates $\Phi_{h_N^q}^*$ by

$$\Upsilon_N^q \;=\; \sum_{i\in S} \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{W}}_N^1} \Phi^*_{q(i),\boldsymbol{z}} \;+\; \sum_{1\le i<j\le M} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}} \Big\{ (q(i)-q(j))\, \widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \;+\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \Phi^*_{q(j),\boldsymbol{z}} \Big\}\,.$$

Recall that the flow $\Phi^*_{c,\boldsymbol{z}}$ is obtained by inserting the constant function $f \equiv c$ into $\Phi^*_{f,\boldsymbol{z}}$, the flow defined at the beginning of Section 5.

Lemma 7.2. *The flow Υ_N^q is divergence-free on $\{\boldsymbol{m}_N^i : i \in S\}^c$ and for each $i \in S$,*

$$(\mathrm{div}\ \Upsilon_N^q)(\boldsymbol{m}_N^i) \;=\; -\kappa_N\, \mu(i)\, (\mathcal{L}_Y q)(i)\,.$$

Furthermore, $\Upsilon_N^q - \Phi^*_{h_N^q}$ is a negligible flow.

Proof. For $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\boldsymbol{z} \in \widehat{\Xi}_N$, the flow $\Phi^*_{c,\boldsymbol{z}}$ is cyclic and thus divergence-free. Hence, the divergence of Υ_N^q is equal to the divergence of the flow

$$\sum_{1\le i<j\le M} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} \big[q(i)-q(j)\big]\, \widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\,.$$

Hence, the first assertion of the lemma follows from Theorem 5.1 and the definitions of $\mathcal{L}_Y$ and μ.

It remains to show that the flow $\Upsilon_N^q - \Phi^*_{h_N^q}$ is negligible. As in the proof of Lemma 6.3, rewrite this flow as

$$\sum_{1\le i<j\le M} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in\mathfrak{S}_{i,j}} \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathring{\mathcal{B}}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}} (q(i)-q(j)) \Big(\widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} - \Phi_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\Big) \;+\; \Delta_N\,, \tag{7.4}$$

where $\Delta_N = \widehat{\Upsilon}_N^q - \Phi^*_{h_N^q}$, with $\widehat{\Upsilon}_N^q$ being the flow obtained from Υ_N^q by replacing $\widetilde{\Phi}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ by $\Phi_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. By Theorem 5.1, the first flow in (7.4) is negligible. As in the proof of Lemma 6.3, the flow Δ_N is negligible because the discrepancies between Υ_N^q and $\Phi^*_{h_N^q}$ appear only at the boundaries of $\mathcal{W}_N^i$, $i \in S$, and of $\mathcal{B}_N^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathfrak{S}$. □

7.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.1.** In view of the remark below Lemma 7.1, choose q as the equilibrium potential between A and B, denoted by $q_{A,B}$. From now on, we write $h_N^{q_{A,B}}$, $\Upsilon_N^{q_{A,B}}$ simply as $h_N^{A,B}$, $\Upsilon_N^{A,B}$, respectively.

Lemma 7.3. *The function $h_N^{A,B}$ satisfies*

$$\mathcal{D}_N(h_N^{A,B}) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \kappa_N\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\,.$$

Moreover, the flow $\Upsilon_N^{A,B}$ is divergence-free on $(\mathcal{E}_N(A) \cup \mathcal{E}_N(B))^c$ and

$$(\mathrm{div}\ \Upsilon_N^{A,B})(\mathcal{E}_N(A)) \;=\; -\,(\mathrm{div}\ \Upsilon_N^{A,B})(\mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;=\; \kappa_N\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\,.$$

Proof. The first part follows from (7.1) and Lemma 7.1, and the second part is a consequence of (7.2), (7.3) and Lemma 7.2. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The upper bound is achieved by using

$$f_N^{A,B} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(h_N^{*,A,B} + h_N^{A,B}) \;\in\; \mathfrak{C}_{1,0}(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))\,,$$
$$\phi_N^{A,B} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(\Upsilon_N^{*,A,B} - \Upsilon_N^{A,B}) \;\in\; \mathfrak{U}_0(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))\,,$$

as the test function and the test flow in Theorem 3.2. On the other hand, the lower bound can be proven by using

$$g_N^{A,B} \;=\; \frac{1}{\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)}\, \frac{h_N^{*,A,B} - h_N^{A,B}}{2} \;\in\; \mathfrak{C}_{0,0}(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))\,,$$
$$\psi_N^{A,B} \;=\; \frac{1}{\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)}\, \frac{\Upsilon_N^{*,A,B} + \Upsilon_N^{A,B}}{2} \;\in\; \mathfrak{U}_1(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))\,,$$

as the test function and flow in Theorem 3.3. The details of the proof are identical to the ones of Theorem 6.1. □

8. Mean Jump Rate

In this section we compute the mean jump rates of the process. Fix $1 \le m \le l$, and write $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)} = \mathcal{E}_N(S_m) = \cup_{i \in S_m} \mathcal{E}_N^i$. Denote by $\mathbb{T}_m(t)$, $t \ge 0$, the amount of time the process $X_N(s)$ remains in the set $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$ in the interval $[0,t]$:

$$\mathbb{T}_m(t) \;:=\; \int_0^t \mathbf{1}\big\{X_N(s) \in \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}\big\}\, ds\,, \quad t \ge 0\,.$$

Let $\mathbb{S}_m(t)$ be the generalized inverse of $\mathbb{T}_m(t)$:

$$\mathbb{S}_m(t) \;:=\; \sup\{s \ge 0 : \mathbb{T}_m(s) \le t\}\,.$$

The *trace* of the process $X_N(t)$ on the set $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$, denoted by $X_N^{(m)}(t)$, is defined as

$$X_N^{(m)}(t) \;=\; X_N(\mathbb{S}_m(t))\,.$$

The process $X_N^{(m)}(t)$ is an $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$-valued Markov process. Denote by $R_N^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$, $\boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$, the jump rates of this process which can be expressed in terms of hitting times. Let $\boldsymbol{r}_N^{(m)}(i,j)$, $i \neq j \in S_m$, be the mean jump rates from the well $\mathcal{E}_N^i$ to the valley $\mathcal{E}_N^j$:

$$r_N^{(m)}(i,j) \;=\; \frac{1}{\mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{E}_N^i} \sum_{\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathcal{E}_N^j} \mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\, R_N^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})\,. \tag{8.1}$$

We define $r_N^{(m)}(i,i) = 0$ just for convenience.

Denote by $\lambda_N^{(m)}(i)$, $i \in S_m$, the mean holding time at $\mathcal{E}_N^i$ for the trace process $X_N^{(m)}$:

$$\lambda_N^{(m)}(i) \;=\; \sum_{j \in S_m} r_N^{(m)}(i,j)\,.$$

By [2, display (A.8)],

$$\mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i)\, \lambda_N^{(m)}(i) \;=\; \mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i, \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)} \setminus \mathcal{E}_N^i)\,,$$

so that, by (2.8) and Theorem 2.1,

$$\lambda_N^{(m)}(i) \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \frac{e^{-N(H-h_i)}}{2\pi N}\, \frac{1}{\nu_i}\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\}, S_m \setminus \{i\})\,. \tag{8.2}$$

The main result of this section provides a sharp estimate for the mean jump rates of the trace process $X_N^{(m)}(t)$. Recall the definition of $c_m(\cdot,\cdot)$ from (2.12).

Theorem 8.1. *For $1 \le m \le l$ and $i \ne j \in S_m$,*

$$r_N^{(m)}(i,j) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\, \frac{e^{-N(H-h_i)}}{2\pi N}\, \frac{c_m(i,j)}{\nu_i}\;.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $1,\, 2 \in S_m$ and then prove Theorem 8.1 for $(i,j)=(1,2)$. We also assume that $\mathrm{cap}_Y(\{1\}, S_m\setminus\{1\}) \ne 0$ because if this is not the case, Theorem 8.1 is a direct consequence of (8.2).

8.1. **Collapsed Process.** We present in this subsection some general results on collapsed processes needed to prove Theorem 8.1. To avoid introducing new notation, we present all results in the context of the Ξ_N-valued Markov chain $X_N(t)$, but all assertions of this subsection hold for general continuous-time Markov chains.

Fix a point $\mathfrak{o} \notin \Xi_N$ and let $\overline{\Xi}_N$ be the set in which the valley $\mathcal{E}_N^1$ is collapsed to a point $\mathfrak{o}$: $\overline{\Xi}_N = (\Xi_N \setminus \mathcal{E}_N^1)\cup\{\mathfrak{o}\}$. Recall from (2.4) that we denote by R_N the jump rates of the chain $X_N(t)$. Let $\overline{X}_N(t)$ be the $\overline{\Xi}_N$-valued Markov chain whose jump rates are given by

$$\begin{cases} \overline{R}_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; R_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{R}_N(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1} R_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{z})\;, & \boldsymbol{x}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{R}_N(\mathfrak{o},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \big[\mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1)\big]^{-1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\mu_N(\boldsymbol{z})\,R_N(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;. \end{cases} \tag{8.3}$$

Denote by $\overline{\mathbb{P}}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N$ the law of $\overline{X}_N$ starting from $\boldsymbol{x}$, and by $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N$, $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_N(\cdot)$, $\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\cdot,\cdot)$ the generator, the Dirichlet form and the capacity, respectively, corresponding to the collapsed process. One can easily verify that the invariant measure $\overline{\mu}_N(\cdot)$ for $\overline{X}_N(t)$ is given by

$$\overline{\mu}_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\;,\;\; \boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\quad \overline{\mu}_N(\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1)\;. \tag{8.4}$$

Denote by $\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ the conductances of the chain $\overline{X}_N$:

$$\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \overline{\mu}_N(\boldsymbol{x})\overline{R}_N(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\;.$$

In view of the previous relations,

$$\begin{cases} \overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1} c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{z})\;, & \boldsymbol{x}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{c}(\mathfrak{o},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1} c(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;. \end{cases} \tag{8.5}$$

The symmetrized conductance is defined by $\overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = [\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) + \overline{c}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})]/2$ for $\boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in\overline{\Xi}_N$. Let $\overline{E}_N = \{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) : \overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})>0\}$ be the set of edges and let $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_N$ be the set of flows on $\overline{E}_N$ endowed with a scalar product analogous to the one introduced in Section 3. Denote the scalar product and the norm by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $||\cdot||_{\mathcal{C}}$, respectively.

For each flow $\phi\in\mathcal{F}_N$, define the collapsed flow $\overline{\phi}\in\overline{\mathcal{F}}_N$ by

$$\begin{cases} \overline{\phi}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{\phi}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1} \phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{z})\;, & \boldsymbol{x}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\\ \overline{\phi}(\mathfrak{o},\boldsymbol{y}) \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1} \phi(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{y})\;, & \boldsymbol{y}\in \Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;. \end{cases} \tag{8.6}$$

Clearly, $\overline{\phi}$ inherits from ϕ the anti-symmetry. Moreover,

$$(\mathrm{div}\,\overline{\phi})(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; (\mathrm{div}\,\phi)(\boldsymbol{x})\;,\;\; \boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\quad (\mathrm{div}\,\overline{\phi})(\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; (\mathrm{div}\,\phi)(\mathcal{E}_N^1)\;. \tag{8.7}$$

Lemma 8.2. *For every flow $\phi\in\mathcal{F}_N$, $\big\|\overline{\phi}\big\|_{\mathcal{C}}\le\|\phi\|$.*

Proof. Decompose the flow norm of ϕ as $\|\phi\|^2=(1/2)(A_1+A_2+A_3)$ where

$$A_1 \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in\Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})^2}{c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}\;,\quad A_2 \;=\; 2\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\notin\mathcal{E}_N^1}\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})^2}{c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}\;,$$

$$A_3 \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})^2}{c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}\;,$$

and the flow norm of $\overline{\phi}$ as $\big\|\overline{\phi}\big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2=(1/2)(\overline{A}_1+\overline{A}_2)$ where

$$\overline{A}_1 \;=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{x},\,\boldsymbol{y}\notin\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\overline{\phi}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})^2}{\overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})}\;,\quad \overline{A}_2 \;=\; 2\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\notin\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\overline{\phi}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})^2}{\overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})}\;.$$

The previous sums are all carried over bonds $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ for which $c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ and $\overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ are strictly positive. By (8.5) and (8.6), it is clear that $A_1=\overline{A}_1$. Thereby, to complete the proof, it suffices to prove $A_2\ge\overline{A_2}$. For each $\boldsymbol{x}$ adjacent to at least one point of $\mathcal{E}_N^1$, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\frac{\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})^2}{c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})} \;\ge\; \frac{\Big(\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\phi(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\Big)^2}{\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}c^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})} \;=\; \frac{\overline{\phi}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})^2}{\overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})}\;.$$

By adding these inequality over $\boldsymbol{x}\notin\mathcal{E}_N^1$ such that $(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})\in\overline{E}_N$, we obtain that $A_2\ge\overline{A}_2$. □

If a function $f:\Xi_N\to\mathbb{R}$ is constant over the set $\mathcal{E}_N^1$, it is possible to collapse it to a function $\overline{f}:\overline{\Xi}_N\to\mathbb{R}$ by setting $\overline{f}(\mathfrak{o})=f(\boldsymbol{z})$ for some $\boldsymbol{z}$ in $\mathcal{E}_N^1$:

$$\overline{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; f(\boldsymbol{x})\;,\;\boldsymbol{x}\in\Xi_N\setminus\mathcal{E}_N^1\;,\quad \overline{f}(\mathfrak{o}) \;=f(\boldsymbol{z}) \text{ for any } \boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1\;. \tag{8.8}$$

For a function $g:\overline{\Xi}_N\to\mathbb{R}$, denote by $\overline{\Phi}_g$, $\overline{\Phi}_g^*$ and $\overline{\Psi}_g$, the flows in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_N$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\Phi}_g(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; g(\boldsymbol{x})\,\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})-g(\boldsymbol{y})\,\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})\;,\\ \overline{\Phi}_g^*(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; g(\boldsymbol{x})\,\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{x})-g(\boldsymbol{y})\,\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})\;,\\ \overline{\Psi}_g(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \;&=\; \overline{c}^s(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})(g(\boldsymbol{x})-g(\boldsymbol{y}))\;.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose that the function $f:\Xi_N\to\mathbb{R}$ is constant over the set $\mathcal{E}_N^1$. Then, the flow obtained by collapsing the flow Φ_f, denoted by $\overline{\Phi_f}$, coincides with the flow $\overline{\Phi}_{\overline{f}}$. The same result holds for the flows Φ^* and Ψ.*

Proof. It suffices to check that these flows coincide on the edges of the form $(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})$, $\boldsymbol{x}\notin\mathcal{E}_N^1$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\Phi_f}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o}) \;&=\; \sum_{\boldsymbol{z}\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\Phi_f(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{z}) \;=\; \sum_{z\in\mathcal{E}_N^1}\big[f(\boldsymbol{x})c(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{z})-f(\boldsymbol{z})c(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{x})\big]\\ &=\; \overline{f}(\boldsymbol{x})\,\overline{c}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})-\overline{f}(\mathfrak{o})\,\overline{c}(\mathfrak{o},\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \overline{\Phi}_{\overline{f}}(\boldsymbol{x},\mathfrak{o})\;.\end{aligned}$$

The proofs for Φ^* and Ψ are analogous. □

8.2. **Mean Jump Rates.** Recall from [2, Proposition 4.2] that

$$\frac{r_N^{(m)}(1,2)}{\lambda_N^{(m)}(1)} \;=\; \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathfrak{o}}^N \Big[H_{\mathcal{E}_N^2} < H_{\mathcal{E}_N(S_m\setminus\{1,2\})} \Big] \;. \tag{8.9}$$

In particular, in view of (8.2), the asymptotic analysis of the mean jump rate $r_N^{(m)}(1,2)$ is reduced to the one of the right hand side of this equation. The following proposition provides this sort of analysis.

Proposition 8.4. *For disjoint subsets A, B of $S\setminus\{1\}$ satisfying $\mathrm{cap}_Y(\{1\}, A\cup B) \neq 0$, we have that*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathfrak{o}}^N \big[H_{\mathcal{E}_N(A)} < H_{\mathcal{E}_N(B)} \big] \;=\; q_{A,B}(1) \;.$$

We divide the proof of Proposition 8.4 into several steps. The first step is to compute the capacity between $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$ with respect to the collapsed chain. Recall from Section 7.2 the notations $h_N^{A,B}$, $f_N^{A,B}$, $\phi_N^{A,B}$, $g_N^{A,B}$ and $\psi_N^{A,B}$. Note that $h_N^{A,B}$, $f_N^{A,B}$ and $g_N^{A,B}$ are constant on $\mathcal{E}_N^1$ and therefore we can collapse them as in the previous subsection. These collapsed functions are denoted respectively by $\overline{h}_N^{A,B}$, $\overline{f}_N^{A,B}$ and $\overline{g}_N^{A,B}$. Note that by the definitions, we have that

$$\overline{h}_N^{A,B}(\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \overline{f}_N^{A,B}(\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; q_{A,B}(1) \;. \tag{8.10}$$

Recall that $\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\cdot,\cdot)$ represents the capacity with respect to the collapsed process $\overline{X}_N(t)$.

Lemma 8.5. *We have that*

$$\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \tag{8.11}$$

and

$$\Big\| \overline{\Psi}_{\overline{h}_N^{A,B}} \Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;. \tag{8.12}$$

Proof. As a by-product of the proof of Theorem 2.1, we obtain that

$$\Big\| \Phi_{f_N^{A,B}} - \phi_N^{A,B} \Big\|^2 \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;. \tag{8.13}$$

For a, $b\in\mathbb{R}$, denote by $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_{a,b}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}_a(\cdot,\cdot)$ the collapsed versions of the sets $\mathfrak{C}_{a,b}(\cdot,\cdot)$ and $\mathfrak{U}_a(\cdot,\cdot)$ introduced in (3.8), (3.9). Then, it is easy to check that $\overline{f}_N^{A,B}$ belongs to $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_{1,0}(\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B))$. By (8.7), we can also verify that $\overline{\phi}_N^{A,B}$ belongs to $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}_0(\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B))$. Hence, by Theorem 3.2, Lemmata 8.2, 8.3 and (8.13), we obtain that

$$\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;\le\; \Big\| \overline{\Phi}_{\overline{f}_N^{A,B}} - \overline{\phi}_N^{A,B} \Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;\le\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;. \tag{8.14}$$

On the other hand, again by the proof of Theorem 2.1,

$$\frac{1}{\Big\| \Phi_{g_N^{A,B}} - \psi_N^{A,B} \Big\|^2} \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\kappa_N\,\mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;.$$

By the similar argument as above, we obtain that

$$\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A),\mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;\ge\; \frac{1}{\Big\| \overline{\Phi}_{\overline{g}_N^{A,B}} - \overline{\psi}_N^{A,B} \Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2} \;\ge\; (1+o_N(1))\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B) \;. \tag{8.15}$$

Now, (8.11) is a direct consequence of (8.14) and (8.15).

Now we prove (8.12). By the definitions of $f_N^{A,B}$, $\phi_N^{A,B}$ and Lemma 7.2, we can write $\Phi_{f_N^{A,B}} - \phi_N^{A,B} = \Psi_{h_N^{A,B}} + R_N$ where R_N is a negligible flow. By Lemma 8.3, collapsing this relation we obtain that

$$\overline{\Phi}_{\overline{f}_N^{A,B}} - \overline{\phi}_N^{A,B} \;=\; \overline{\Psi}_{\overline{h}_N^{A,B}} + \overline{R}_N \tag{8.16}$$

By Lemma 8.2, the flow $\overline{R}_N$ inherits the negligibility from R_N. On the other hand, we obtain from (8.11) and (8.14) that

$$\Big\| \Phi_{\overline{f}_N^{A,B}} - \overline{\phi}_N^{A,B} \Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;=\; \big[1 + o_N(1)\big]\, \kappa_N \, \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\;.$$

The second assertion of the lemma follows from the two previous displayed formulas, from the fact that $\overline{R}_N$ is negligible, and from Lemma 5.9. □

The next two results will be used in the proof of Proposition 8.4. First, by [11, display (3.10)], for any $A \subset \Xi_N \setminus \mathcal{E}_N^1$,

$$\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathfrak{o}, A) \;=\; \mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1, A)\;. \tag{8.17}$$

Lemma 8.6. *For two disjoint subsets A, B of $\overline{\Xi}_N$,*

$$\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(A,B) \;\le\; 4\,L^2\,\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N^s(A,B)\;,$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N^s(\cdot,\cdot)$ stands for the capacity with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N^s = (1/2)(\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N + \overline{\mathcal{L}}_N^*)$.

Proof. By [11, Lemma 2.6], it suffices to prove that the generator $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N$ inherits the sector condition from $\mathcal{L}_N$. Fix two functions $f, g : \overline{\Xi}_N \to \mathbb{R}$, and define their extensions $F, G : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$F(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \begin{cases} f(\boldsymbol{x}) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{E}_N^1 \\ f(\mathfrak{o}) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{E}_N^1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad G(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \begin{cases} g(\boldsymbol{x}) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \notin \mathcal{E}_N^1 \\ g(\mathfrak{o}) & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathcal{E}_N^1\;. \end{cases}$$

By [11, display (3.8)] and by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f, (-\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N)\, g\rangle_{\overline{\mu}_N}^2 \;&=\; \langle F, (-\mathcal{L}_N)\, G\rangle_{\mu_N}^2 \;\le\; 4\,L^2\,\langle F, (-\mathcal{L}_N)\, F\rangle_{\mu_N}\,\langle G, (-\mathcal{L}_N)\, G\rangle_{\mu_N} \\ &=\; 4\,L^2 \langle f, (-\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N)\, f\rangle_{\overline{\mu}_N}\,\langle g, (-\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N)\, g\rangle_{\overline{\mu}_N}\;. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 8.4. Denote by $U_N^{A,B}$ the equilibrium potential between $\mathcal{E}_N(A)$ and $\mathcal{E}_N(B)$ for the collapsed process. Hence, by Lemma 8.5,

$$\Big\| \overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}} \Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;=\; \overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B)) \;=\; (1 + o_N(1))\kappa_N \mathrm{cap}_Y(A,B)\;. \tag{8.18}$$

On the other hand, since $\overline{\phi}_N^{A,B}$ belongs to $\overline{\mathfrak{U}}_0(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))$,

$$\Big\langle \overline{\phi}_N^{A,B}, \overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}} \Big\rangle_{\mathcal{C}} \;=\; 0\;.$$

Therefore, by (3.7), by the fact that $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N U_N = 0$ on $(\mathcal{E}_N(A) \cup \mathcal{E}_N(B))^c$ and that $\overline{f}_N$ and U_N coincide on $\mathcal{E}_N(A) \cup \mathcal{E}_N(B)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big\langle \overline{\Phi}_{\overline{f}_N^{A,B}} - \overline{\phi}_N^{A,B}, \overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}} \Big\rangle_{\mathcal{C}} \;=\; \Big\langle \overline{f}_N^{A,B}, (-\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N) U_N^{A,B} \Big\rangle_{\overline{\mu}_N} \;=\; \Big\langle U_N^{A,B}, (-\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N) U_N^{A,B} \Big\rangle_{\overline{\mu}_N} \\ &\quad=\; \overline{\mathrm{cap}}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A), \mathcal{E}_N(B))\;. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, by (8.16) and (8.18),

$$\Big\langle \overline{\Psi}_{\overline{h}_N^{A,B}}, \overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}} \Big\rangle_{\mathcal{C}} \;=\; (1+o_N(1))\kappa_N \operatorname{cap}_Y(A,B)\;.$$

Let $\Delta_N = U_N^{A,B} - \overline{h}_N^{A,B}$. By Lemma 8.5, by (8.18) and by the previous identity,

$$\big\|\overline{\Psi}_{\Delta_N}\big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;=\; \Big\|\overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}}\Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 + \Big\|\overline{\Psi}_{\overline{h}_N^{A,B}}\Big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 - 2\,\Big\langle \overline{\Psi}_{\overline{h}_N^{A,B}}, \overline{\Psi}_{U_N^{A,B}} \Big\rangle_{\mathcal{C}} \;=\; \kappa_N\, o_N(1)\;.$$

Since $\Delta_N = 0$ on $\mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B)$, we may write Δ_N as $\Delta_N = \Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})\cdot\widetilde{\Delta}_N$ for some $\widetilde{\Delta}_N$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}_{1,0}(\{\mathfrak{o}\}, \mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B))$.

By the Dirichlet principle for the reversible process $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_N^s$,

$$\big\|\overline{\Psi}_{\Delta_N}\big\|_{\mathcal{C}}^2 \;=\; \overline{\mathcal{D}}_N(\Delta_N) \;=\; [\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\,\overline{\mathcal{D}}_N(\widetilde{\Delta}_N) \;\geq\; [\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\,\overline{\operatorname{cap}}_N^s(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B))\;.$$

By Lemma 8.6, by (8.17), and by Theorem 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
[\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\,\overline{\operatorname{cap}}_N^s(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B)) \;&\geq\; (2L)^{-2}[\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\,\overline{\operatorname{cap}}_N(\mathfrak{o}, \mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B)) \\
&=\; (2L)^{-2}[\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\operatorname{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^1, \mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B)) \\
&=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,(2L)^{-2}\,[\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2\,\kappa_N\operatorname{cap}_Y(\{1\}, A\cup B)\;.
\end{aligned}$$

By the last three displayed equations and the condition of the proposition, we obtain that $[\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o})]^2 = o_N(1)$. This completes the proof since

$$\Delta_N(\mathfrak{o}) \;=\; \overline{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathfrak{o}}^N\big[H_{\mathcal{E}_N(A)} < H_{\mathcal{E}_N(B)}\big] - q_{A,B}(1)$$

by the definition of the equilibrium potential and (8.10). □

Proof of Theorem 8.1. By (8.2), (8.9), and by Proposition 8.4, we obtain that

$$r_N^{(m)}(1,2) \;=\; \big[1+o_N(1)\big]\,\frac{e^{-N(H-h_1)}}{2\pi N}\,\frac{1}{\nu_1}\operatorname{cap}_Y(\{1\}, S_m\setminus\{1\})\,q_{\{2\},S_m\setminus\{1,2\}}(1)\;.$$

Hence, it suffices to prove

$$c_m(1,2) \;=\; \operatorname{cap}_Y(\{1\}, S_m\setminus\{1\})\,q_{\{2\},S_m\setminus\{1,2\}}(1) \tag{8.19}$$

in order to complete the proof.

Recall the reversible Markov chain $Y(t)$ on S. Denote by $Y^{(m)}(t)$ the trace of $Y(t)$ on the set S_m and by $r^{(m)}(\cdot,\cdot)$ the jump rate of $Y^{(m)}(t)$. Then, by [1, Proposition 6.2], the left hand side of (8.19) can be written as $\mu(1)r^{(m)}(1,2)$.

On the other hand, by [2, display (A.8)],

$$\operatorname{cap}_Y(\{1\}, S_m\setminus\{1\}) \;=\; \mu(1)\sum_{j\in S_m\setminus\{1\}} r^{(m)}(1,j)\;,$$

and by [2, Proposition 4.2],

$$q_{\{2\},S_m\setminus\{1,2\}}(1) \;=\; \frac{r^{(m)}(1,2)}{\sum_{j\in S_m\setminus\{1\}} r^{(m)}(1,j)}\;.$$

By the last two displayed equations, we can verify that the right hand side of (8.19) is $\mu(1)r^{(m)}(1,2)$ as well.

9. Metastability

We present in this section the proof of Theorem 2.2, which is very similar to the one of the reversible model [18]. It relies on the precise asymptotic estimates of the mean jump rate between metastable sets obtained in the previous section. We first recall [2, Theorem 2.1] in the present context. All proofs which are omitted below can be found in [1, 2, 11, 18].

Recall the notation introduced at the beginning of the previous section. Denote by $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)} : \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)} = \cup_{i\in S_m} \mathcal{E}_N^i \to S_m$ the projection given by

$$\widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;=\; \sum_{i\in S_m} i\, \mathbf{1}\{\boldsymbol{x}\in \mathcal{E}_N^i\}\,,$$

and by $Y_N^{m,T}(t)$ the S_m-valued, hidden Markov chain obtained by projecting the trace process $X_N^{(m)}(t)$ with $\widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)}$:

$$Y_N^{m,T}(t) \;=\; \widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)}(X_N^{(m)}(t))\,.$$

Recall that $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$, $1\le i\le M$, stands for the bottom of the well $\mathcal{E}_N^i$ with respect to the potential F.

Theorem 9.1 ([2, Theorem 2.1])**.** *Suppose that there exists a sequence $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_N : N\ge 1)$ of positive numbers such that, for every pair $i\neq j\in S_m$, the following limit exists*

$$r^{(m)}(i,j) \;:=\; \lim_{N\to\infty} \theta_N\, r_N^{(m)}(i,j)\,. \tag{9.1}$$

Suppose, furthermore, that for each $i\in S_m$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\mathcal{E}_N^i} \frac{\mathrm{cap}_N\big(\mathcal{E}_N^i, \mathcal{E}_N(S_m\setminus\{i\})\big)}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\boldsymbol{m}_i^N,\boldsymbol{y})} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{9.2}$$

Then, for any sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N : N\ge 1\}$, $\boldsymbol{x}_N\in\mathcal{E}_N^i$, under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^N$, the rescaled process $Y_N^{m,T}(t\theta_N)$ converges in the Skorohod topology to a S_m-valued Markov chain with jump rates $r^{(m)}(j,k)$ and which starts from i.

We claim that conditions (9.1), (9.2) are fulfilled for $\theta_N := \beta_N^{(m)} = 2\pi N\exp\{\theta_m N\}$ and $r^{(m)}(j,k) := r_m(j,k)$, where $\beta_N^{(m)}$ has been introduced in (2.14) and $r_m(j,k)$ in (2.13).

Indeed, on the one hand, by Theorem 8.1,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \beta_N^{(m)}\, r_N^{(m)}(i,j) \;=\; \mathbf{1}\{i\in T_m\}\,\frac{c_m(i,j)}{\nu_i} \;\; ;\; i\neq j\in S_m\,. \tag{H0}$$

Note that the right hand side is precisely the rate $r_m(i,j)$.

On the other hand, we claim that for each $1\le i\le M$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{E}_N^i} \frac{\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i, \mathcal{E}_N(S_m\setminus\{i\}))}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\{\boldsymbol{x}\})} \;=\; 0\,. \tag{H1}$$

In view of the sector condition presented in Lemma 3.1 and of [11, Lemmata 2.5 and 2.6], it is enough to prove the previous estimate for the symmetric capacities. This is precisely the content of [18, Lemma 6.2].

It follows from Theorem 9.1 and from **(H0)**, **(H1)** that the the rescaled process $Y_N^{m,T}(t\beta_N^{(m)})$ converges in the Skorohod topology to the S_m-valued Markov chain with jump rates $r_m(j,k)$.

The previous convergence does not provide much information on the original process $X_N(t)$ if it spends a non-negligible amount of time outside the set $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$. But this is not the case. We claim that for every $1 \le i \le M$ and for every $T > 0$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \sup_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{E}_N^i} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{x}}^N \Big[\int_0^T \mathbf{1}\Big\{ X_N(\beta_N^{(m)}t) \in \Xi_N \setminus \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)} \Big\}\, dt \Big] \;=\; 0\,. \tag{M3}$$

The proof of this assertion is similar to the one of [18, Proposition 6.1] and is therefore omitted.

One may prefer to state results on the original process $X_N(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ than on its trace $X_N^{(m)}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$. This issue is extensively discussed in the introduction of [15]. To do that, we may either introduce a weaker topology and prove the convergence of the hidden Markov chain $Y_N^{(m)}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$, introduced above (2.13), to the S_m-valued Markov chain characterized by the jump rates r_m, or to prove the convergence of the last-visit process.

Last-visit process. Denote by $Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(t)$ the process which at time t records the last set $\mathcal{E}_N^i$, $i \in S_m$, visited by the process $X_N(r)$ before time t. More precisely, let

$$\sigma_N(t) \;:=\; \sup\big\{ s \le t : X_N(s) \in \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)} \big\}\,,$$

with the convention that $\sigma_N(t) = 0$ if the set $\{s \le t : X_N(s) \in \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}\}$ is empty. Assume that $X_N(0)$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$ and define $Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(t)$ by

$$Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(t) \;=\; \begin{cases} \widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)}(X_N(\sigma_N(t))) & \text{if } \; X_N(\sigma_N(t)) \in \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}, \\ \widehat{\Psi}_N^{(m)}(X_N(\sigma_N(t)-)) & \text{if } \; X_N(\sigma_N(t)) \notin \mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}. \end{cases}$$

We refer to $Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(t)$ as the *last-visit process* (to $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$). The next result, which is Proposition 4.4 in [1], asserts that if the process $Y_N^{m,T}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the Skorohod topology, and if the time spent by $X_N(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ outside $\mathcal{E}_N^{(m)}$ is negligible, then the process $Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the Skorohod topology to the same limit.

Proposition 9.2 ([1, Proposition 4.4])**.** *Fix $i \in S_m$ and a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N : N \ge 1\}$, $\boldsymbol{x}_N \in \mathcal{E}_N^i$. Suppose that under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^N$ the process $Y_N^{m,T}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the Skorohod topology to a S_m-valued Markov chain, denoted by $Y^{(m)}(t)$. Suppose, furthermore, that* (**M3**) *is fulfilled. Then, the last-visit process $Y_N^{m,\mathrm{V}}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ also converges in the Skorohod topology to the Markov chain $Y^{(m)}(t)$.*

Soft topology. We introduced in [15] the soft topology. As the precise definition requires much notation we do not reproduce it here. Next result is Theorem 5.1 in [15]. In the present context, it asserts that the hidden Markov chain $Y_N^{(m)}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the soft topology to a S_m-valued Markov chain $Y^{(m)}(t)$ if the process $Y_N^{m,T}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the Skorohod topology to $Y^{(m)}(t)$, and if condition **(M3)** is in force.

Proposition 9.3 ([15, Theorem 5.1])**.** *Fix $i \in S_m$ and a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_N : N \ge 1\}$, $\boldsymbol{x}_N \in \mathcal{E}_N^i$. Suppose that under the measure $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}_N}^N$ the process $Y_N^{m,T}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the Skorohod topology to a S_m-valued Markov chain, denoted by $Y^{(m)}(t)$. Suppose, furthermore, that* (**M3**) *is fulfilled. Then, the hidden Markov chain $Y_N^{(m)}(\beta_N^{(m)}t)$ converges in the soft topology to $Y^{(m)}(t)$.*

The assertion of Theorem 2.2 is a consequence of (**H0**), (**H1**), (**M3**) and of Theorem 9.1 and Proposition 9.3.

10. Proof of Theorem 2.5

Fix two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N. Define the harmonic measure $\nu_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$, $\nu^*_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ as

$$\nu_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \,=\, \frac{\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\lambda_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathbb{P}^N_{\boldsymbol{x}}\big[\,H^+_{\mathcal{B}} < H^+_{\mathcal{A}}\,\big]}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}\,,$$

$$\nu^*_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \,=\, \frac{\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\lambda_N(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathbb{P}^{*,N}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\big[\,H^+_{\mathcal{B}} < H^+_{\mathcal{A}}\,\big]}{\mathrm{cap}^*_N(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}\,,\quad \boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{A}\,.$$

Denote by $\mathbb{E}^N_\nu$ the expectation associated to the Markov process $\{X_N(t) : t\ge 0\}$ with initial distribution ν, where ν is a probability measure on Ξ_N. Next result is [2, Proposition A.2].

Proposition 10.1. *Fix two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ of Ξ_N. Let $g : \Xi_N \to \mathbb{R}$ be a μ_N-integrable function. Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}^N_{\nu^*_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}}\Big[\int_0^{H_{\mathcal{B}}} g(X_N(t))\,dt\Big] \,=\, \frac{\langle\, g\,,\, V^*_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}\rangle_{\mu_N}}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})}\,,$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mu_N}$ represents the scalar product in $L^2(\mu_N)$.

In view of this proposition, in order to estimate $\mathbb{E}^N_{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i}[H_{\mathcal{M}^N_i}]$ it suffices to estimate the capacity $\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i\},\mathcal{M}^N_i)$ and the expectation of the equilibrium potential $E_{\mu_N}[V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i\},\mathcal{M}^N_i}]$. The following two lemmata provide these desired estimates.

Lemma 10.2. *We have that*

$$\mathrm{cap}_N\big(\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i\},\,\mathcal{M}^N_i\big) \,=\, [1+o_N(1)]\;Z_N^{-1}\,(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}\,e^{-NH}\sum_{j\in S_u} c_u(i,j)\,.$$

Proof. Note in Lemma 7.2 that the test flows used in the proof of Theorem 2.1 were divergence free not only on $\mathcal{E}_N(A\cup B)^c$ but also on $\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i : i\in A\cup B\}^c$. Hence, the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 is not affected if we replace $\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N(A),\,\mathcal{E}_N(B))$ by $\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_j : j\in A\},\,\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_j : j\in B\})$. By inserting $A=\{i\}$ and $B = S_u\setminus\{i\}$ into this modified version of Theorem 2.1, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{cap}\,\big(\{\boldsymbol{m}^N_i\},\,\mathcal{M}^N_i\big) \,=\, [1+o_N(1)]\;Z_N^{-1}\,(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}e^{-NH}\,\mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\},\,S_u\setminus\{i\})\,.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{j\in S_u} c_u(i,j) \,=\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\},\,S_u\setminus\{i\})\,.$$

Denote by $Y^{S_u}(\cdot)$ the trace process of $Y(\cdot)$ on the set S_u, and by $r^{S_u}(\cdot,\cdot)$ the jump rate of $Y^{S_u}(\cdot)$. By (2.12) and [2, Display (A.8)], we have that $c_u(i,j) = \mu(i) r^{S_u}(i,j)$ for all $i,\,j\in S_u$. Hence,

$$\sum_{j\in S_u} c_u(i,j) \,=\, \mu(i)\sum_{j\in S_u} r^{S_u}(i,j) \,=\, \mu(i)\,r^{S_u}(i,S_u\setminus\{i\}) \,=\, \mathrm{cap}_Y(\{i\},\,S_u\setminus\{i\})\,,$$

where the last equality follows again from [2, display (A.8)]. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We recall the following well-known estimate on the equilibrium potential (cf. [16, display (3.3)]): for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \Xi_N$ and disjoint sets A, $B \subset \Xi_N$ with $\boldsymbol{x} \notin A \cup B$,

$$V_{A,B}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;\le\; \frac{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\, A)}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\, B)}\,. \tag{10.1}$$

Since $\mathrm{cap}_N = \mathrm{cap}_N^*$, the same inequality also holds for $V^*_{A,B}(\boldsymbol{x})$.

Lemma 10.3. *We have that*

$$E_{\mu_N}\big[V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N}\big] \;=\; [1+o_N(1)]\;\vartheta_N\,\nu_i\;,$$

where $\vartheta_N = Z_N^{-1}\,(2\pi N)^{\frac{d}{2}-1}\,e^{-Nh_i}$.

Proof. In view of (2.8), it suffices to prove that

$$E_{\mu_N}\Big[V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N}\Big] \;-\; \mu_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i) \;=\; o_N(1)\,\vartheta_N\;.$$

The left hand side can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{E}_N^i} (V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x})-1)\,\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \;+\; \sum_{j:j\neq i}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{E}_N^j} V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\quad+\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in(\mathcal{E}_N)^c} V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N}(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\;.
\end{aligned} \tag{10.2}$$

The first sum is equal to

$$-\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in\mathcal{E}_N^i} V^*_{\mathcal{M}_i^N,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\}}(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x})\;.$$

By (10.1), by the monotonicity of capacity and by the fact that the symmetric capacity is bounded by the capacity, $\mathrm{cap}_N^s \le \mathrm{cap}_N$ (cf. [11, Lemma 2.6]),

$$V^*_{\mathcal{M}_i^N,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;\le\; \frac{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\,\mathcal{M}_i^N)}{\mathrm{cap}_N(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\})} \;\le\; \frac{\mathrm{cap}_N(\mathcal{E}_N^i,\,\check{\mathcal{E}}_N^i)}{\mathrm{cap}_N^s(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\})}\,. \tag{10.3}$$

To estimate the denominator, let $l_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ be a continuous path connecting $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$ such that $F(\boldsymbol{y}) \le H-\epsilon$ for all $\boldsymbol{y}\in l_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. By discretizing this path, as in the proof of Proposition 5.7, we obtain a good path (cf. Section 5.2) $\Gamma_x = (\boldsymbol{x}_0,\,\boldsymbol{x}_1,\,\cdots,\,\boldsymbol{x}_L)$ connecting $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$ where $L = O(N)$. Denote by $\chi_{\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}},1}$ the unit flow from $\boldsymbol{x}$ to $\boldsymbol{m}_i^N$ introduced in (5.11). By the Thomson principle for reversible Markov chains,

$$\frac{1}{\mathrm{cap}_N^s(\{\boldsymbol{x}\},\,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\})} \;\le\; \|\chi_{\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{x}},1}\|^2 \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{L-1}\frac{1}{\mu_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\,R_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i,\boldsymbol{x}_{i+1})} \;\le\; C\,N\,Z_N\,e^{N(H-\epsilon)}\;. \tag{10.4}$$

Hence, by (10.3), (10.4) and by Theorem 6.1, we obtain

$$V^*_{\mathcal{M}_i^N,\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\}}(\boldsymbol{x}) \;\le\; C\,N^{\frac{d}{2}}\,e^{-N\epsilon}\;.$$

In particular, by (2.8), the absolute value of the first sum in (10.2) is bounded by $o_N(1)\,\vartheta_N$. By similar arguments, the second summation in (10.2) is also of order $o_N(1)\vartheta_N$.

On the other hand, as $V^*_{\{\boldsymbol{m}_i^N\},\mathcal{M}_i^N} \le 1$, the last summation in (10.2) is bounded by

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in(\mathcal{E}_N)^c} Z_N^{-1}\,e^{-NF(\boldsymbol{x})} \;\le\; C\,N^d\,Z_N^{-1}\,e^{-N(H-\epsilon)}\;.$$

Since $H - \epsilon > h_i$, it is obvious that the last summation is of order $o_N(1)\vartheta_N$, which completes the proof of the lemma. □

Theorem 2.5 follows immediately from Proposition 10.1 and Lemmata 10.2, 10.3.

11. Appendix

We present in this appendix a generalization of Sylvester's law of inertia.

Lemma 11.1. *Let $\mathbb{X}$, $\mathbb{Y}$ be $n \times n$ matrices. Assume that $\mathbb{Y}$ is a non-singular, symmetric matrix which has only one negative eigenvalue, and that*

$$\mathbb{X}^s = (\mathbb{X} + \mathbb{X}^\dagger)/2 \text{ is positive definite}\,. \tag{11.1}$$

Then, $\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}$ has one negative eigenvalue and $(n-1)$ positive eigenvalues.

Proof. By usual diagonalization and conjugation argument, it suffices to consider the case where $\mathbb{Y} = \mathrm{diag}(-1, 1, \dots, 1)$. It is well-known that a matrix $\mathbb{X}$ satisfying (11.1) does not have negative eigenvalue and that $\det \mathbb{X} > 0$. Hence, $\det(\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}) = -\det \mathbb{X} < 0$ and $\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}$ has at least one negative eigenvalue.

Assume that $\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}$ has two negative eigenvalues $-a$, $-b$ and let $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\boldsymbol{w}$ be the corresponding eigenvectors. Denote by u_1, w_1 the first coordinates of $\boldsymbol{u}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}$. If $u_1 = 0$, then $\mathbb{Y}\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}$ and hence

$$-a\boldsymbol{u} \;=\; \mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}\boldsymbol{u} \;=\; \mathbb{X}\boldsymbol{u}\,,$$

which is a contradiction since $\mathbb{X}$ does not have negative eigenvalue. Thus, $u_1 \neq 0$ and similarly, $w_1 \neq 0$.

By definition of a, b and by (11.1), or any $c \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(\boldsymbol{u} + c\boldsymbol{w})^\dagger \mathbb{Y}(a\boldsymbol{u} + bc\boldsymbol{w}) \;=\; -(\boldsymbol{u} + c\boldsymbol{w})^\dagger \mathbb{Y}\mathbb{X}\mathbb{Y}(\boldsymbol{u} + c\boldsymbol{w}) < 0\,.$$

Let $p = -u_1/(bw_1)$. By substituting c by ap in the previous equation the first coordinate of $a\boldsymbol{u} + bc\boldsymbol{w}$ vanishes. Thus, since $\mathbb{Y}\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{z}$ if the first coordinate of $\boldsymbol{z}$ is zero,

$$(\boldsymbol{u} + ap\boldsymbol{w}) \cdot (a\boldsymbol{u} + abp\boldsymbol{w}) \;=\; (\boldsymbol{u} + ap\boldsymbol{w})^\dagger \mathbb{Y}(a\boldsymbol{u} + abp\boldsymbol{w}) \;<\; 0\,.$$

Similarly, substituting c by bp in order to make the first coordinate of $\boldsymbol{u} + c\boldsymbol{w}$ equal to 0, we obtain that

$$(\boldsymbol{u} + bp\boldsymbol{w}) \cdot (a\boldsymbol{u} + b^2 p\boldsymbol{w}) \;=\; (\boldsymbol{u} + bp\boldsymbol{w})^\dagger \mathbb{Y}(a\boldsymbol{u} + b^2 p\boldsymbol{w}) \;<\; 0\,.$$

Summing the previous inequality with the penultimate one multiplied by b/a we obtain that

$$(a+b)\,|\boldsymbol{u} + bp\boldsymbol{w}|^2 \;<\; 0\,,$$

which is a contradiction. □

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referee for her/his comments which helped to improve the presentation of the results.

References

[1] J. Beltrán, C. Landim: Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains. J. Stat. Phys. **140**, 1065-1114, (2010)

[2] J. Beltrán, C. Landim: Tunneling and metastability of continuous time Markov chains II. J. Stat. Phys. **149**, 598-618, (2012)

[3] J. Beltrán, C. Landim: A Martingale approach to metastability. Probab. Theory Related Fields **161**, 267–307 (2015)

[4] N. Berglund: Kramers' law: validity, derivations and generalisations. Markov Processes Relat. Fields **19**, 459–490 (2013)

[5] F. Bouchet, J. Reygner: Generalisation of the Eyring-Kramers transition rate formula to irreversible diffusion processes. preprint (2015) http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.02104

[6] A. Bovier, M. Eckhoff, V. Gayrard, M. Klein: Metastability in stochastic dynamics of disordered mean-field models. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **119**, 99–161 (2001)

[7] A. Bovier, M. Eckhoff, V. Gayrard, M. Klein: Metastability in reversible diffusion process I. Sharp asymptotics for capacities and exit times. J. Eur. Math. Soc. **6**, 399–424 (2004)

[8] A. Bovier, F. den Hollander: *Metastability: a potential-theoretic approach*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **351**, Springer, Berlin, 2015.

[9] M. Cassandro, A. Galves, E. Olivieri, M. E. Vares: Metastable behavior of stochastic dynamics: a pathwise approach. J. Stat. Phys. **35**, 603–634 (1984)

[10] H. Eyring: The activated complex in chemical reactions. J Chem. Phys. **3**, 107–115 (1935)

[11] A. Gaudillière, C. Landim: A Dirichlet principle for non reversible Markov chains and some recurrence theorems. Probab. Theory Related Fields **158**, 55–89 (2014)

[12] T. Komorowski, C. Landim, S. Olla: *Fluctuations in Markov processes: time symmetry and martingale approximation*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften **345**. Springer Science & Business Media, Berlin, 2012

[13] H. A. Kramers: Brownian motion in a field of force and the diffusion model of chemical reactions. Physica **7**, 284–304 (1940)

[14] C. Landim: Metastability for a Non-reversible Dynamics: The Evolution of the Condensate in Totally Asymmetric Zero Range Processes. Commun. Math. Phys. **330**, 1–32 (2014)

[15] C. Landim: A topology for limits of Markov chains. Stoch. Proc. Appl. **125**, 1058–1098 (2014)

[16] C. Landim, P. Lemire: Metastability of the Two-Dimensional Blume-Capel Model with Zero Chemical Potential and Small Magnetic Field. J. Stat. Phys. **164**, 346–376 (2016).

[17] C. Landim, M. Mariani, I. Seo:. A Dirichlet and a Thomson principle for non-selfadjoint elliptic operators, Metastability in non-reversible diffusion processes. arXiv:1701.00985 (2017)

[18] C. Landim, R. Misturini, K. Tsunoda: Metastability of reversible random walks in potential field. J. Stat. Phys. **160**, 1449–1482 (2015)

[19] C. Landim, I. Seo: Metastability of non-reversible mean-field Potts model with three spins. J. Stat. Phys. **165**, 693–726 (2016)

[20] C. Landim, T. Xu: Metastability of finite state Markov chains: a recursive procedure to identify slow variables for model reduction. ALEA, Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat. **13**, 725751 (2016)

[21] R. Misturini: Evolution of the ABC model among the segregated configurations in the zero temperature limit. To appear in Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, Probab. Stat. arXiv:1403.4981 (2014)

[22] E. Olivieri, M. E. Vares: *Large deviations and metastability*. In: Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 100. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005

[23] M. Röckner: General theory of Dirichlet forms and applications. In Dirichlet Forms, edited by G. Dell'Antonio, U. Mosco, Springer, 1993

[24] M. Slowik: A note on variational representations of capacities for reversible and nonreversible Markov chains. unpublished, Technische Universität Berlin, 2012

IMPA, Estrada Dona Castorina 110, CEP 22460 Rio de Janeiro, Brasil and CNRS UMR 6085, Université de Rouen, Avenue de l'Université, BP.12, Technopôle du Madrillet, F76801 Saint-Étienne-du-Rouvray, France.
e-mail: landim@impa.br

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, N.Y. 10012-1185, USA.
e-mail: insuk@cims.nyu.edu